2024

CALENDAR YEAR

JUVENILE & FAMILY DIVISION

ANNUAL REPORT

MISSOURI COURTS
Judicial Branch of Government

Table of Contents

Section 1: Missouri's Youth Population 1

Figure 1-1 Youth Population 1

Figure 1-2 Projected Youth Population 1

Figure 1-3 Projected Youth Population by Sex 2

Figure 1-4 Projected Youth Population by Sex and Age 2

Figure 1-5 Projected Youth Population by Race 3

Section 2: Juvenile & Family Division Referrals 4

Table 2-1 Source of Referrals 5

Figure 2-1 Referrals by Referral Type 6

Figure 2-2 Referrals by Sex 6

Figure 2-3 Referrals by Race 7

Table 2-2 Referrals by Age 7

Figure 2-4 Youth Referral Trend 8

Figure 2-5 Youth Referral by Sex 8

Figure 2-6 Youth Referral by Race 9

Figure 2-7 Youth Referrals by Action Taken 12

Figure 2-8 Youth Referrals by Outcome 12

Section 3: Law Violation Referrals 13

Table 3-1 Source of Law Violations Referrals 13

Figure 3-1 Law Violation Referrals by Charge Level 14

Figure 3-2 Law Violation Referrals by Charge Level and Sex 14

Figure 3-3 Law Violation Referrals by Charge Level and Race 15

Figure 3-4 Law Violation Referrals by Charge Level and Age 15

Table 3-2 Top Law Violation Referrals 16

Table 3-3 Top Law Violation Referrals by Major Allegation and Age Group 17

Figure 3-5 Law Violation Referrals by Action Taken 18

Figure 3-6 Law Violation Referrals by Action Taken 18

Section 4: Status Offense Referrals 19

Table 4-1 Source of Status Offense Referrals 19

Figure 4-1 Status Offense Referrals by Allegation 20

Figure 4-2 Status Offense Referrals by Allegation and Sex 20

Table 4-2 Status Offense Referrals by Allegation and Race....21
Table 4-3 Status Offense Referrals by Allegation and Age....22
Figure 4-4 Status Offense Referrals by Action Taken....23
Figure 4-5 Status Offense Referrals by Outcome....23
Section 5: Child Abuse and Neglect Referrals....24
Table 5-1 Source of CA/N Referrals....24
Figure 5-1 CA/N Referrals by Allegation Type....25
Figure 5-2 CA/N Referrals by Allegation and Sex....25
Table 5-2 CA/N Referrals by Allegation and Race....26
Table 5-3 CA/N Referrals by Allegation and Age....26
Figure 5-3 CA/N Referrals by Action Taken....27
Figure 5-4 CA/N Referrals by Outcome....27
Section 6: Assessment & Classification....28
Figure 6-1 Risk by Level....30
Figure 6-2 Risk Level by Sex....30
Figure 6-3 Risk Level by Race....31
Tables 6-1 Risk Factors....32
Tables 6-2 Need Factors....34
Section 7: Detention....38
Table 7-1 General Youth Population August 31, 2022....39
Figure 7-1 General Admissions by Sex....39
Figure 7-2 General Admissions by Race....40
Figure 7-3 General Admissions by Sex and Race....40
Figure 7-4 General Admissions by Age Group....41
Figure 7-5 General Admissions by Sex and Age Group....41
Figure 7-6 General Admissions by Race and Age Group....42
Figure 7-7 General Average Daily Population by Sex....42
Figure 7-8 General Average Daily Population by Race....43
Figure 7-9 General Average Daily Population by Sex and Race....43
Figure 7-10 General Average Daily Population by Age Group....44
Figure 7-11 General Average and Median Length of Stay by Sex....44
Figure 7-12 General Average and Median Length of Stay by Race....45
Figure 7-13 General Average Length of Stay by Sex and Race....45

Figure 7-14 General Median Length of Stay by Sex and Race 46
Figure 7-15 General Median Length of Stay by Age Group 46
Figure 7-16 Certified Youth Admissions by Sex 47
Figure 7-17 Certified Youth Admissions by Race 47
Figure 7-18 Certified Youth Admissions by Sex and Race 48
Figure 7-19 Certified Youth Admissions by Age Group 48
Figure 7-20 Certified Youth Admissions by Sex and Age Group 49
Figure 7-21 Certified Youth Admissions by Race and Age Group 49
Figure 7-22 Certified Youth Average Daily Population by Sex 50
Figure 7-23 Certified Youth Average Daily Population by Race 50
Figure 7-24 Certified Youth Average Daily Population by Sex and Race 51
Figure 7-25 Certified Youth Average Daily Population by Age 51
Figure 7-26 Certified Youth Average and Median Length of Stay by Sex 52
Figure 7-27 Certified Youth Average and Median Length of Stay by Race 52
Figure 7-28 Certified Youth Average Length of Stay by Sex and Race 53
Figure 7-28 Certified Youth Median Length of Stay by Sex and Race 53
Figure 7-29 Certified Youth Average and Median Length of Stay by Age 54
Section 8: Division of Youth Services Commitments 55
Figure 8-1 Statewide DYS Commitments by Sex and Race 55
Figure 8-2 Statewide DYS Commitments by Age Group 55
Tables 8-1 Statewide DYS Commitments by Sex, Race, and Age Group 56
Section 9: Certification to Adult Court 57
Figure 9-1 Certifications by Sex 57
Figure 9-2 Certifications by Race 58
Figure 9-3 Certifications by Age 58
Figure 9-4 Certifications Trends by Race 59
Section 10: Juvenile Offender Recidivism 60
Figure 10-1 Missouri Youth Offender Population 61
Figure 10-2 Percentage of Youth Recidivating (All Law) 61
Figure 10-3 Percentage of Youth Recidivating (Misd A or Felony) 62
Figure 10-4 Percentage of Youth Recidivating (Felony) 62
Figure 10-5 Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Year 63
Figure 10-6 Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Sex 63

Figure 10-7 Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Race 64
Figure 10-8 Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Circuit Type 64
Figure 10-9 Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Age 65
Section 11: Racial and Ethnic Disparity (RED) 66
Table 11-1 Identifying the Numerical Bases for Rate Calculations 68
Table 11-2 Relative Rate Index (RRI) Values 68
Table 11-3 Statewide Relative Rate Indices 69
Figure 11-1 Ten-Year Trend of Statewide RRI for Referrals of Black Youth 69
Section 12: Juvenile Officer Workload 70
Table 12-1 Workload Values per Year from Juvenile Officer Workload Study (2020) 71
Table 12-2 Juvenile Officer Weighted Workload 72
Section 13: CA/N Time Standards 73
Table 13-1 CA/N Hearings Held Timely 74
Section 14: Juvenile and Family Division Programs and Diversion 76
Table 14-1 Juvenile Program Categories and the number of Participants 78
Table 14-2 Juvenile Diversion Programs and the number of participants 79

Section 1: Missouri's Youth Population

Section 1 describes the 2023 population of Missouri's youth (ages 5-17).

Figure 1-1 Youth Population

In CY23, Missouri's youth population, ages 5-17, was 1,026,656. This represents roughly a 1.3% increase from the previous year; and a 1.9% increase from 2019.

Source table 2019: Population Estimates by Age - 2019 (data.census.gov)

Source table 2023: Population Estimates by Age - 2023 (data.census.gov)



Figure 1-2 Projected Youth Population

Population projections, compiled in 2008 for the Missouri youth population, suggested it would decrease until approximately 2015. From 2015-2020, it was projected to have a 3.3% increase. Then, it is projected to continue growing by less than 2% every 5 years, and by 2030 have a total increase of 3.4% from 2020.

Source Table: Web Formating (Male and Female Combined).xls (mo.gov)



Figure 1-3 Projected Youth Population by Sex

In CY23, 51% [526,598] of Missouri's youth population was male and 49% [500,058] was female.

Source Table: State Population by Characteristics: 2023 (census.gov)



Figure 1-4 Projected Youth Population by Sex and Age

In CY23, males outnumbered females across all age groups in Missouri's population of 5-17-year-old youths. The largest age group for males was 16 and the largest for females was 15.

Source Table: State Population by Characteristics: 2023 (census.gov)



Figure 1-5 Projected Youth Population by Race

Using the population with only one race, the youth population in Missouri is 68% [732,122] White. Black is the second most common race for 5-17 years old at 11% [123,864] followed by youth with two or more races at 11% [118,453], Hispanic at 8% [81,764], Asian/Pacific Islander at 2% [21,713], and Native American at less than 1% [2,294].

Source Table: State Population by Characteristics: Sex by age (White alone) (census.gov)

Source Table: State Population by Characteristics: Sex by age (Black alone) (census.gov)

Source Table: State Population by Characteristics: Sex by age (Hispanic) (census.gov)

Source Table: State Population by Characteristics: Sex by age (Asian) (census.gov)

Source Table: State Population by Characteristics: Sex by age (Hawaiian & Pacific Islander) (census.gov)

Source Table: State Population by Characteristics: Sex by age (Native American) (census.gov)

Source Table: State Population by Characteristics: Sex by age (Two or More Races) (census.gov)



Section 2: Juvenile & Family Division Referrals

The Missouri Juvenile Officer Performance Standards (2017) define a juvenile and family division referral as *"the initial information provided to the juvenile officer from the referring agency inclusive of the identifying information and basis for the jurisdiction of the juvenile court."* For the purpose of annual reporting, unless otherwise indicated, disposed referrals represent the unit of measurement, not individual youth. A disposition refers to the outcome or finding of a referral [see pages 13-14 for details about how these dispositions and outcomes are reported in Missouri's case management systems]. In July 2021, the maximum age for referrals raised from 16-17.

The juvenile and family division is responsible for processing and supervising four referral types:

- **Status Offenses:** Status offense referrals include Behavior Injurious to Self/Others, Habitually Absent from Home, Truancy, Beyond Parental Control, and Status-Other. **Note:** The following offenses are also counted as Status Offenses: Juvenile Municipal Ordinance for Curfew and Possession/Use Of A Tobacco Product. All other municipal ordinance violations that are explicitly labeled with "JUVMUNI" in the charge code are considered delinquency (https://www.courts.mo.gov/file.jsp?id=2018).

- **Law Offenses:** Law offense referrals include all criminal violations listed in the Missouri Charge Code Manual, including infraction and ordinance violations.

- **Child Abuse and Neglect (CA/N):** CA/N referrals are allegations of child abuse or neglect where the child is the victim or custody related matters are an issue. Abuse referrals include Abuse-Emotional, Abuse-Incest, Abuse-Other Sexual, and Physical Abuse. Neglect referrals include Abandonment, Neglect-Education, Neglect-Improper Care/Supervision, Neglect-Medical Care, Neglect-Surgical Care, and Neglect-Other. Custody referrals include Abduction, Protective Custody, Transfer of Custody, Termination of Parental Rights, and Relief of Custody.

- **Administrative:** Administrative referrals include Violation of Valid Court Order, Juvenile Informal Supervision/Technical Violation, and Juvenile Formal Supervision/Technical Violation. Counts of Administrative referrals throughout this report include these additional violations: Prob / Parole Violation and Probation Violation (Municipal Ordinance). While not sanctioned for use on juvenile referrals, circuits have used these charge codes in calendar year 2024.

Section 2 presents information on disposed referrals at the state level for the juvenile and family division in calendar year 2024.

Table 2-1 Source of Referrals

Referrals to Missouri's juvenile and family division originate from a variety of sources. In CY24, 55% of all referrals originated from some type of law enforcement agency (Municipal Police, County Sheriff, Highway Patrol, and Other Law Enforcement), primarily municipal police [42%]. The Children's Division of Missouri's Department of Social Services accounted for 16% of all referrals. An additional 18% of referrals came from schools (School Personnel and Resource Officer).

Missing Data [581]

Source of Referral	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Municipal Police	17,675	42.5%
Children's Division	6,734	16.2%
School Personnel	5,010	12.1%
County Sheriff	4,899	11.8%
School Resource Officer	2,708	6.5%
Juvenile Court Personnel	1,541	3.7%
Parent	1,226	2.9%
Other	577	1.4%
Other Juvenile Court	438	1.1%
Other Law Enforcement	390	0.9%
Highway Patrol	173	0.4%
Other Relative	63	0.2%
Private Social Agency	57	0.1%
Public Social Agency	49	0.1%
Victim or Self	23	0.1%
Department of Mental Health	5	0.0%
Total	**41,568**	**100.0%**

Figure 2-1 Referrals by Referral Type

In CY24, a total of 42,149 referrals were disposed. The largest percentage [44%, 18,349] was for delinquency allegations. The rest of the referrals were divided between abuse/neglect allegations [25%, 10,650], status offenses [30%, 12,538], and administrative offenses [2%, 612].

Missing Data [0]

Note: Juvenile Municipal Ordinance violations for Curfew and Possession/Use Of A Tobacco Product are considered status offenses.



Figure 2-2 Referrals by Sex

For all the disposed referrals in CY24, males accounted for 61% [25,585] and females for the remaining 39% [16,351].

Missing Data [22]



Figure 2-3 Referrals by Race

Approximately, 67.4% [27,665] of all disposed referrals were for White youth. The second largest percentage of referrals were 29.2% [12,001] for Black youth. The remaining groups were Hispanic youth which accounted for 2.4% [967], Asian/Pacific Islander youth which accounted for 0.7% [271], and Native American youth which accounted for 0.1% [124].

Missing Data [1,083]

Note: Missing Data includes the Unknown race option



Table 2-2 Referrals by Age

Those under 10 years of age, represented 17.3% [7,291] of all referrals. Youth aged 16, accounted for the next largest proportion of referrals, [17.1%, 7,204], followed by youth aged 15, [15.8%, 6,679] and youth aged 17 or older [15.5%, 6,548].

Missing Data [0]

Age	Frequency	Percentage
<10	7,291	17.3%
10	999	2.4%
11	1,551	3.7%
12	2,433	5.8%
13	3,854	9.1%
14	5,550	13.2%
15	6,679	15.8%
16	7,204	17.1%
> = 17	6,548	15.5%
Grand Total	**42,149**	**100.0%**

Figure 2-4 Youth Referral Trend

The total number of disposed referrals declined by 31% from 2012 to 2024. The trend shows the greatest decrease in administrative referrals (-56%). All other referral types decreased: status referrals (-20%), CA/N referrals (-37%), and delinquency referrals (-31%) over that period. Since last year, there was a decrease in CA/N referral types (-10%), status (-6%)and administrative (-20%). There was an increase in delinquency (2%).



Figure 2-5 Youth Referral by Sex

Disposed referrals declined more for females (-32%) than for males (-30%) from 2012 to 2024. Between 2023 and 2024, the number of referrals for males decreased by 3.3% and the number of referrals for females decreased by 5.5%.



Figure 2-6 Youth Referral by Race

From 2012-2024, disposed referrals increased for Native American youth (11.7%), and Asian/Pacific Islander youth (18.3%). Disposed referrals decreased for White youth (-35.5%), Black youth (-25.6%), and Hispanic youth (-25.8%)

Note: Asian/Pacific Islander and Native American youth are not displayed to maintain readability.



Referral Outcomes

The juvenile and family division will respond to referrals either through a formal or informal process. Through the formal process, a juvenile officer files a petition in the juvenile and family division to have a judge hear and determine the outcome of the allegations contained in the petition. Through the informal process, a juvenile officer determines the outcome of the allegations contained in the referral without filing a petition seeking formal judicial jurisdiction. The following referral outcomes are recorded on the ***Additional Docket Data*** field in ***Show-Me Courts Docketing tab*** when the VDYSD docket code is entered to indicate additional DYS data.

Formal Outcomes:

- **Allegation True, Youth Receives Out-of-Home Placement** – A judicial action finding the allegation true. Youth is placed out-of-home with the Division of Youth Services (DYS), in foster care, with a relative, or with a private or public agency.
- **Allegation True, Youth Receives In-Home Services** – A judicial action finding the allegation true. Youth receives services while remaining in his or her home. This outcome requires the youth to receive supervision through the juvenile division.
- **Allegation True, No Services** – A judicial action finding the allegation true; however, the youth receives no services or supervision.
- **Allegation Not True –** A judicial action which results in the termination of a juvenile case during the initial juvenile division hearing because the allegation is found not true.
- **Sustain Motion to Dismiss –** The court finds that a motion to dismiss should be sustained and the case is closed.
- **Juvenile Certified – Felony Allegation -** A judicial action sustaining a motion to dismiss a petition to the juvenile division and allow prosecution of youth under the general law.

Informal Outcomes:

- **Informal Adjustment without Supervision:** Any informal non-judicial activity that occurs without the filing of a petition and does not involve supervision of youth. Although services may be monitored, this disposition does not include direct supervision of a youth in accordance with the Missouri Juvenile Officer Performance Standards. However, because the disposition is applied on the basis of an informal adjustment conference, completion of the mandated risk and needs assessments is required when the referral is for a status or delinquency allegation.

- **Informal Adjustment with Supervision:** Any informal non-judicial activity that occurs without the filing of a petition and involves supervision of youth by written agreement and complies with Missouri Supreme Court Rules for an informal adjustment conference and the relevant contact standards contained in the Missouri Juvenile Officer Performance Standards. This disposition requires completion of the risk and needs assessment when the referral is for a status or delinquency allegation.

- **Informal Adjustment – No Action:** Any informal non-judicial activity that entails no more than brief face-to-face, telephone, or warning letter with the intent to inform, counsel, and warn the youth and/or family regarding a referral received. No official informal adjustment conference, per Supreme Court Rule is held; therefore, completion of the mandated risk or needs assessments is not required when the referral is for a status or delinquency allegation.

- **Transfer to Other Juvenile Division**: A non-judicial activity where a youth's case file and associated records are transferred to another juvenile division for disposition. Depending on when this disposition is applied, an official informal adjustment conference and associated assessments may or may not occur.

- **Transfer to Other Agency:** A non-judicial activity where a youth's case file and associated records are transferred to another agency (CD, DMH, DYS, or other public or private agency) for disposition. Depending on when this disposition is applied, an official informal adjustment conference and associated assessments may or may not occur.

- **Referral Rejected:** The referral is rejected because there is insufficient information for administrative action to proceed or the referral is found not true. No informal adjustment conference is conducted and no assessments are required.

Figure 2-7 Youth Referrals by Action Taken

In CY24, 76% [32,228] of all referrals were disposed through the informal process. Only 21% [8,712] of referrals required formal court intervention. Remaining cases are missing disposition information.

Missing Data [1,209]



Figure 2-8 Youth Referrals by Outcome

Informal Adjustment – No Action [19.9%, 8,408] was the most frequently used informal finding, and the most frequently used formal finding was Allegation Found True with Out-of-Home Placement [12.3%, 5,190].

Missing Data [1,209]

*Formal outcomes



Section 3: Law Violation Referrals

Section 3 describes law violation referrals disposed by Missouri's juvenile and family division. Law violation referrals made up 41% of all referrals disposed in calendar 2024. A law violation referral is counted as a single delinquent act represented by the most serious allegation charged (misdemeanor or higher). However, multiple delinquent acts may be associated with a single referral.

Note: Infractions and municipal ordinances are included under law violations. Juvenile municipal ordinances for Curfew and Possession/Use Of A Tobacco Product are listed under status offenses.

Table 3-1 Source of Law Violations Referrals

The source of 84% of law violation referrals was some form of law enforcement agency (Municipal Police, County Sheriff, Highway Patrol, and Other Law Enforcement), primarily municipal police [66.4%] and county sheriff departments [15.0%]. Schools were the second highest referring agency [12.5%] (School Personnel and Resource Officer combined).

Missing Data [202]

Source of Referral	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Municipal Police	12,182	66.4%
County Sheriff	2,758	15.0%
School Resource Officer	1,861	10.1%
School Personnel	447	2.4%
Other Law Enforcement	234	1.3%
Juvenile Court Personnel	162	0.9%
Highway Patrol	147	0.8%
Other Juvenile Court	140	0.8%
Children's Division	130	0.7%
Parent	34	0.2%
Other	29	0.2%
Public Social Agency	9	0.0%
Other Relative	6	0.0%
Victim or Self	4	0.0%
Private Social Agency	3	0.0%
Department of Mental Health	1	0.0%
Total	**18,349**	**100.0%**

Figure 3-1 Law Violation Referrals by Charge Level

The most common charge level for law referrals was misdemeanor [63.6%, 11,671] with Class A misdemeanors accounting for the largest amount [36.0%, 6,611]. Felonies represented 32.3% of law referrals, with Class D being the most common type of felony referral [13.9%, 2,557]. Roughly five percent of all law violations were for Class A and B felonies [361 & 517].

Missing Data [0]



Figure 3-2 Law Violation Referrals by Charge Level and Sex

Law violations at the misdemeanor level were the most common allegation for both male and female offenders. However, within sex, the percentage of referrals for misdemeanors was higher for females [74%, 4,004] than for males [59%, 7,626]. Conversely, males were referred at a higher rate [37%, 4,766] for felonies than were females [21%, 1,151].

Missing Data [58]



Figure 3-3 Law Violation Referrals by Charge Level and Race

Misdemeanor was the most common charge among all race categories. As a percentage, felony referrals were higher for youth of color and Asian/Pacific Islander youth than White youth and Native American youth: Black youth [40%, 2,677], Native American youth [18%, 7], Hispanic youth [33%, 136], White youth [28%, 3,022], Asian/Pacific Islander youth [37%, 41].

Missing Data [166]



Figure 3-4 Law Violation Referrals by Charge Level and Age

Youth aged 17 and older were responsible for the largest number of misdemeanors [2,532]. Youth aged 17 and older accounted for the largest number of felonies [1,703]. Youth aged 10 were proportionally the most likely to commit misdemeanors (76%, 132], while youth aged 17 and older were proportionally the most likely to commit felonies [39%, 1,703].

Missing Data [11]



Table 3-2 Top Law Violation Referrals

Violations for Assault, Property Damage, Stealing, Peace Disturbance, and Dangerous Drugs accounted for the majority [70%] of major allegations on law referrals. The Top 5 Law Violations remain unchanged from the previous year. According to *Juvenile Court Statistics 2022* report published by the National Center for Juvenile Justice, assault was also the most common offense for juveniles in the United States. Following assault, the next highest number of cases handled by juvenile courts nationwide were larceny-theft, and then followed by obstruction of justice.

Missing Data [0] **Note:** Juvenile municipal ordinances for Curfew and Possession/Use of A Tobacco Product are considered status offenses.

Top Law Violations	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Assault	5,363	29.2%
Property Damage	2,334	12.7%
Stealing	2,326	12.7%
Peace Disturbance	1,659	9.0%
Dangerous Drugs	1,141	6.2%
Sexual Assault	600	3.3%
Liquor Laws	587	3.2%
Invasion of Privacy	552	3.0%
Weapons	498	2.7%
Obstructing Police	478	2.6%
Burglary	444	2.4%
Threats	432	2.4%
Municipal Charges	329	1.8%
Health and Safety	303	1.7%
Obscenity	269	1.5%
Robbery	228	1.2%
Sex Offenses	139	0.8%
Motor Vehicle Violations	135	0.7%
Obstruct Jud Proc	99	0.5%
Fraud	85	0.5%
Public Order Crimes	66	0.4%
Homicide	64	0.3%
Flight/Escape	41	0.2%
Arson	39	0.2%
Stolen Property	35	0.2%
Family Offenses	30	0.2%
Juvenile Offenses	18	0.1%
Conservation *	17	0.1%
Kidnapping	15	0.1%
Forgery	14	0.1%
Other	9	0.0%
Total	**18,349**	**100.0%**

Table 3-3 Top Law Violation Referrals by Major Allegation and Age Group

Forty-two percent of all juvenile law violation referrals were committed by youth aged 15 and 16. These youth were responsible for 40% of homicides, 47% of drug charges, 46% of liquor law violations, 44% of robberies, and 45% of stealing referrals.

Missing Data [11] **Note:** Juvenile municipal ordinances for Curfew and Possession/Use Of A Tobacco Product are considered status offenses.

Major Allegation/Age	**<10**	**10**	**11**	**12**	**13**	**14**	**15**	**16**	**>=17**	**Total**
Assault	67	75	192	366	655	904	1,006	1,050	1,045	5,360
Property Damage	24	18	48	104	196	355	548	523	516	2,332
Stealing	9	11	27	86	165	298	481	560	689	2,326
Peace Disturbance	41	27	63	124	179	289	344	319	273	1,659
Dangerous Drugs	3	0	9	37	92	141	236	295	327	1,140
Sexual Assault	15	9	18	31	41	102	109	88	186	599
Liquor Laws	0	0	1	4	32	47	82	189	232	587
Invasion of Privacy	5	6	9	23	70	84	109	109	136	551
Weapons	11	6	8	18	25	60	91	127	152	498
Obstructing Police	1	2	9	12	27	60	107	115	145	478
Burglary	9	0	9	13	37	59	93	95	129	444
Threats	14	13	29	54	70	83	76	55	38	432
Municipal Charges	2	1	13	20	36	46	59	75	77	329
Health And Safety	3	2	4	11	23	53	53	85	68	302
Obscenity	5	0	10	15	48	65	54	38	32	267
Robbery	0	1	0	5	16	22	44	58	82	228
Sex Offenses	4	1	4	19	11	17	24	18	41	139
Motor Vehicle Violations	0	0	1	0	6	18	21	37	52	135
Obstruct Jud Proc	0	1	0	4	4	19	19	22	30	99
Fraud	0	0	2	3	7	9	20	23	21	85
Public Order Crimes	2	0	1	3	6	9	20	12	13	66
Homicide	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	17	35	64
Flight/Escape	0	0	0	1	0	2	9	12	17	41
Arson	1	0	1	4	4	11	3	11	4	39
Stolen Property	0	0	0	1	0	5	6	10	13	35
Family Offenses	3	0	2	0	1	2	5	10	7	30
Juvenile Offenses	0	0	0	1	2	2	4	8	1	18
Conservation *	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	10	17
Kidnapping	1	1	1	2	1	1	0	3	5	15
Forgery	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	10	14
Other	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	1	4	9
Total	**220**	**174**	**461**	**961**	**1,758**	**2,769**	**3,632**	**3,973**	**4,390**	**18,338**

Figure 3-5 Law Violation Referrals by Action Taken

Eighty-two percent [15,099] of law violation referrals were disposed through the informal adjustment process. Sixteen percent [2,849] required formal court intervention. Remaining cases are missing outcome information.

Missing Data [401]



Figure 3-6 Law Violation Referrals by Action Taken

The most frequently used methods of disposing law violation referrals were Referral Rejected [20.0%, 3,673] and Informal Adjustment No Action [18.5%, 3,399]. Allegation Found True with In-Home Services was the most frequently applied formal outcome [8.0%, 1,470], followed by Allegation Found True-Out-of-Home Placement [3.5%, 648]. Only 0.5% [90] of referrals resulted in petitions for Certification to Adult Court.

Missing Data [401]

*Formal outcomes



Section 4: Status Offense Referrals

Section 4 describes status offense referrals disposed by the juvenile and family division. Status offense referrals made up 30% of all referrals in calendar 2024. A status violation referral is counted as a single behavioral act represented by the most serious allegation charged. However, multiple status offense acts may be associated with a single referral. Juvenile Municipal Ordinance violations for Curfew and Possession/Use Of A Tobacco Product are considered Status offenses.

Table 4-1 Source of Status Offense Referrals

Forty nine percent of status violation referrals originated from some form of law enforcement agency (Municipal Police, County Sheriff, Highway Patrol, and Other Law Enforcement), primarily municipal police [35%] and county sheriff departments [13%]. Schools [38%] were the second highest referring agency (School Personnel and Resource Officer combined), followed by parents [6%] and Children's Division [4%].

Missing Data [44]

Source of Referral	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Municipal Police	4,375	34.9%
School Personnel	3,956	31.6%
County Sheriff	1,591	12.7%
Parent	767	6.1%
School Resource Officer	764	6.1%
Children's Division	455	3.6%
Juv Court Personnel	284	2.3%
Other Law Enforcement	102	0.8%
Other Juv Court	55	0.4%
Other	45	0.4%
Other Relative	35	0.3%
Public Social Agency	25	0.2%
Highway Patrol	19	0.2%
Victim or Self	11	0.1%
Private Social Agency	8	0.1%
Department of Mental Health	2	0.0%
Total	**12,494**	**100.0%**

Figure 4-1 Status Offense Referrals by Allegation

Behavior Injurious to Self or Others [41%, 5,104] was the most frequent status offense for which youth were referred, followed by Truancy [23%, 2,906]. Muni-Curfew and Muni-Possession/Use Of A Tobacco Product constitutes less than 2% of status offense referrals.



Figure 4-2 Status Offense Referrals by Allegation and Sex

Behavior Injurious to Self/Others was the most common allegation for both males [46%, 3,240] and females [34%, 1,847]. Proportionally, females were more likely than males to be referred for Beyond Parental Control, Truancy and Habitually Absent from Home.

Missing Data [30]



Table 4-2 Status Offense Referrals by Allegation and Race

Behavior Injurious to Self/Others was the most common reason to be referred for White youth [44%, 3,942], Black youth [32%, 936] and Native American youth [56%, 18]. Hispanic youth [35%, 90] and Asian/Pacific Islander youth [36%, 27] were most referred for Truancy.

Missing Data [269]

Note: Missing Data includes the Unknown race option

Allegation /Race	**White**	**Black**	**Hispanic**	**Asian/ Pacific Islander**	**Native American**	**Total**
Behavior Injurious To Self/Others	3,942	936	85	23	18	5,004
Truancy	2,082	584	90	27	9	2,792
Habitually Absent From Home	1,189	903	38	7	2	2,139
Beyond Parental Control	1,332	322	29	5	3	1,691
Status Offense - Other	331	73	10	0	0	414
Muni - Curfew	77	85	3	1	0	166
Muni-Possession / Use Of A Tobacco Product	33	13	0	11	0	57
Total	**8,986**	**2,916**	**255**	**74**	**32**	**12,263**

Table 4-3 Status Offense Referrals by Allegation and Age

Behavior Injurious to Self/Others was the most common type of referral for youth of all ages. Youth aged younger than 10 were the group most often referred for Truancy [29%, 200]. The youth 17 or older were proportionally more likely to be referred for being Habitually Absent from Home [25%, 398]. Also, youth aged 12 years old were proportionally more likely to be referred for being Beyond Parental Control [17%, 155].

Missing Data [19]

Allegation/Age	**<10**	**10**	**11**	**12**	**13**	**14**	**15**	**16**	**>=17**	**Total**
Behavior Injurious to Self/Others	369	174	282	409	588	817	856	885	713	5,093
Truancy	200	58	140	228	398	497	573	614	197	2,905
Habitually Absent from Home	23	17	32	109	233	379	432	532	398	2,155
Beyond Parental Control	70	51	89	155	241	296	313	314	180	1,709
Status Offense - Other	29	10	19	32	47	64	72	80	75	428
Muni - Curfew	0	0	3	3	14	25	38	42	43	168
Muni-Possession / Use of A Tobacco Product	0	0	1	3	11	14	14	9	9	61
Total	**691**	**310**	**566**	**939**	**1,532**	**2,092**	**2,298**	**2,476**	**1,615**	**12,519**

Figure 4-4 Status Offense Referrals by Action Taken

The vast majority of status offense referrals [94%, 11,732] were disposed through the informal process, leaving only 6% [691] to be disposed through the formal court process. Remaining cases are missing outcome information.

Missing Data [115]



Figure 4-5 Status Offense Referrals by Outcome

Informal Adjustment, No Action [31%, 3,942] was the most frequently used method for disposing status referrals, followed by Informal Adjustment without Supervision [23%, 2,838]. Allegation True with In-Home Services was the most frequently applied formal outcome [3%, 340].

Missing Data [115]

*Formal outcomes



Section 5: Child Abuse and Neglect Referrals

Section 5 describes child abuse and neglect (CA/N) referrals disposed by Missouri's juvenile and family division. CA/N referrals made up 25% of all referrals in calendar 2024. A CA/N referral is counted as a single event, represented by the most serious allegation where a youth is the victim. However, a youth may be the victim of multiple incidences of abuse and/or neglect at the time at which they are referred.

Table 5-1 Source of CA/N Referrals

Roughly 59% of all CA/N referrals are from Children's Division (CD) of Missouri's Department of Social Services (DSS). Law enforcement agencies (Municipal Police, County Sheriff, Highway Patrol, and Other Law Enforcement) were responsible for 15% of the referrals. Approximately 7% of the referrals originated from schools (School Personnel and Resource Officer combined).

Missing Data [288]

Source of Referral	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Children's Division	6,141	59.3%
Municipal Police	978	9.4%
Juv Court Personnel	710	6.9%
School Personnel	600	5.8%
County Sheriff	540	5.2%
Other	502	4.8%
Parent	424	4.1%
Other Juv Court	239	2.3%
School Resource Officer	83	0.8%
Other Law Enforcement	53	0.5%
Private Social Agency	40	0.4%
Other Relative	22	0.2%
Public Social Agency	15	0.1%
Highway Patrol	7	0.1%
Victim or Self	6	0.1%
Department of Mental Health	2	0.0%
Total	**10,362**	**100.0%**

Figure 5-1 CA/N Referrals by Allegation Type

Neglect-Improper Care/Supervision represented [47%, 4,969] most of all CA/N referrals, followed by Neglect-Other [18%, 1,882], and Abuse-Physical [9%, 927]

Missing Data [0]



Figure 5-2 CA/N Referrals by Allegation and Sex

Within sex, the percentage of neglect related referrals were higher for males [74%, 3,852] than for females [72%, 3,834]. Conversely, referrals for abuse were greater for females [18%, 941] compared with their male counterparts [15%, 759].

Missing Data [95]



Table 5-2 CA/N Referrals by Allegation and Race

Neglect was the most common type of referral for all youth [73%, 7,303]. Proportionately, Asian/Pacific Islander youth were the most likely group to be referred for abuse [21%, 15].

Missing Data [587]

Note: Missing Data includes the Unknown race option

Race/Allegation	Juvenile Abuse	Protective Custody	Juvenile Neglect	Total
White	1,251	762	5,671	7,684
Black	329	288	1,332	1,949
Hispanic	47	35	209	291
Native American	5	7	33	45
Asian/Pacific Islander	15	0	58	73
Grand Total	**1,647**	**1,092**	**7,303**	**10,042**

Table 5-3 CA/N Referrals by Allegation and Age

The vast majority of abuse, neglect, and custody referrals were for youth younger than 10 [60%, 6,377].

Missing Data [10]

Age/Allegation	Juvenile Abuse	Protective Custody	Juvenile Neglect	Total
< 10	771	738	4,868	6,377
10	72	54	389	515
11	105	50	368	523
12	107	38	382	527
13	114	49	357	520
14	141	57	386	584
15	135	73	392	600
16	164	67	372	603
>= 17	105	48	238	391
Grand Total	**1,714**	**1,174**	**7,752**	**10,640**

Figure 5-3 CA/N Referrals by Action Taken

Fifty-one percent of CA/N referrals were disposed through the informal court process [5,158]. Forty-nine percent [4,876] of referrals were handled through the formal court process. The remainder were missing data.

Missing Data [616]



Figure 5-4 CA/N Referrals by Outcome

Allegation True, Out-of-Home Placement was the most frequently applied outcome [40%, 4,265] to CA/N referrals, followed by Transfer to Other Agency [13%, 1,418], and Referral Rejected [12%, 1,314]

Missing Data [616]

*Formal outcomes



Section 6: Assessment & Classification

In 1995, the Missouri General Assembly passed the Juvenile Crime and Crime Prevention Bill [HB 174]. The bill was aimed at reshaping Missouri's juvenile justice system through the development of a comprehensive juvenile justice strategy. As part of the strategy, the Office of State Courts Administrator was charged with coordinating an effort to design and implement a standardized assessment process for classifying juvenile offenders. The result of this effort was the Missouri Juvenile Offender Classification System.

The Missouri Juvenile Offender Classification System includes an empirically validated risk assessment for estimating a youthful offender's relative likelihood of future delinquency and a classification matrix that links the level of risk and offense severity to a recommended set of graduated sanctions. The system also includes a needs assessment for identifying the underlying psychosocial needs of youth.

Since its inception, the Missouri Juvenile Offender Classification system has helped Missouri's juvenile justice professionals to ensure public safety and promote statewide consistency in the services and supervision of youthful offenders.

The Missouri Juvenile Officer Performance Standards (2017) sections 2.6 Risk Assessment and 2.7 Needs Assessment mandates the juvenile officer complete a Missouri Juvenile Officer Risk Assessment and Missouri Juvenile Officer Needs Assessment on "all juveniles with a legally sufficient referral for a delinquent or status offense if an informal adjustment conference was conducted, or the matter was subject to adjudication." Subsequent risk assessments are to be completed "if the juvenile receiving services is subject to a new delinquent or status offense referral, and additional sanctions or services will be required." Subsequent needs assessments are to be completed "upon significant changes in the juvenile's circumstances or every 90 days as an indicator of progress toward the supervision or treatment goals."

Section 6 presents information on juveniles with referrals who were disposed during calendar 2024, and who had risk and needs assessments entered on the ***Custom Assessment Maintenance (CZAASMT)*** form of JIS. When a referral has more than one associated risk/needs assessment(s), the highest score is reported. When a referral is not associated with any risk/needs assessment(s) in the reporting year, the score associated with the risk/needs assessment that was completed on the nearest date before or after the initial filing date of the referral is the one that is reported, regardless of the year the assessment was completed. Figures 6-1 to 6-3 provide risk level information with Tables 6-1 and 6-2 providing information about the prevalence of individual risk and need factors. **

***Readers should refer to Missouri's Juvenile Offender Risk & Needs Assessment and Classification System Manual (2005) for the operational definitions of risk and needs factors.*

Figure 6-1 Risk by Level

The majority of youth [61%, 7,417] scored at moderate risk for future delinquent acts on risk assessments in CY24. The remaining youth scored at low [24%, 2,910] or high-risk levels [15%, 1,747].

Missing Data [0]



Figure 6-2 Risk Level by Sex

Proportionately, more male youth [15%, 1,226] were assessed high risk than females [13%, 516]. Male youth were also more likely to be low risk [24%, 1,928] compared to females [23%, 960]. Females [64%, 2,610] were more likely than their male counterparts [60%, 4,785] to be assessed moderate risk.

Missing Data [42]



Figure 6-3 Risk Level by Race

Proportionately, more Black youth [20%, 589] were assessed high risk than White youth [13%, 1,096]. White youth [25%, 2,156] were more likely than their Black counterparts [20%, 580] to be assessed low risk.

Missing Data [193]



Tables 6-1 Risk Factors

Missing [20]

Age at First Referral	Frequency	Percentage
12 and under	4,016	33.3%
13	1,814	15.0%
14	1,987	16.5%
15	1,923	15.9%
16	2,314	19.2%

Prior Referrals	Frequency	Percentage
None	5,570	46.1%
One or more	6,484	53.7%%

Assault Referrals	Frequency	Percentage
No prior or present referrals for assault	8,383	69.4%
One or more prior or present referrals for misdemeanor assault	2,757	22.8%
One or more prior or present referrals for felony assault	914	7.6%

History of Placement	Frequency	Percentage
No prior out-of-home placement	8,527	70.6%
Prior out-of-home placement	3,527	29.2%

Peer Relationships	Frequency	Percentage
Neutral influence	6,536	54.1%
Negative influence	4,415	36.6%
Strong negative influence	1,103	9.1%

History of Child Abuse/Neglect	Frequency	Percentage
No history of child abuse/neglect	9,058	75.0%
History of child abuse/neglect	2,996	24.8%

Substance Abuse	Frequency	Percentage
No alcohol or drug abuse problem is apparent	8,753	72.5%
Moderate alcohol and/or drug abuse problem	2,835	23.5%
Severe alcohol and/or drug abuse/dependence	466	3.9%

School Attendance/Disciplinary	Frequency	Percentage
No or only minor problems	5,399	44.7%
Moderate problems	4,604	38.1%
Severe problems	2,051	17.0%

Parental Management Style	Frequency	Percentage
Effective management style	5,663	46.9%
Moderately effective management style	4,966	41.1%
Severely ineffective management style	1,425	11.8%

Parental History of Incarceration	Frequency	Percentage
No prior incarceration	8,673	71.8%
Prior incarceration	3,381	28.0%

*Missing data accounts for 0.2% of referrals.

Tables 6-2 Need Factors

Missing [133]

Behavior Problems	Frequency	Percentage
No significant behavior problem	4,702	39.7%
Moderate behavior problem	5,230	44.2%
Severe behavior problem	1,765	14.9%

Attitude	Frequency	Percentage
Motivated to change/accepts responsibility	7,726	65.3%
Generally uncooperative, defensive, not motivated to change	3,158	26.7%
Very negative attitude, defiant, and resistant to change	813	6.9%

Interpersonal Skills	Frequency	Percentage
Good interpersonal skills	7,178	60.7%
Moderately impaired interpersonal skills	3,916	33.1%
Severely impaired interpersonal skills	603	5.1%

Peer Relationships	Frequency	Percentage
Neutral influence	6,378	53.9%
Negative Influence	4,239	35.8%
Strong negative Influence	1,080	9.1%

History of Child Abuse/Neglect	Frequency	Percentage
No history child abuse/neglect	8,748	73.9%
History of child abuse/neglect	2,949	24.9%

Mental Health	Frequency	Percentage
No mental health disorder	7,219	61.0%
Mental health disorder with treatment	3,532	29.9%
Mental health disorder with no treatment	946	8.0%

Substance Abuse	Frequency	Percentage
No alcohol or drug abuse problem is apparent	8,516	72.0%
Moderate alcohol and/or drug abuse problem	2,730	23.1%
Severe alcohol and/or drug abuse/dependence	451	3.8%

School Attendance	Frequency	Percentage
No or only minor problems	5,303	44.8%
Moderate problems	4,383	37.0%
Severe problems	2,011	17.0%

Academic Performance	Frequency	Percentage
Passing without difficulty	6,250	52.8%
Functioning below average	3,660	30.9%
Failing	1,787	15.1%

Learning Disorder	Frequency	Percentage
No diagnosed learning disorder	9,875	83.5%
Diagnosed learning disorder	1,822	15.4%

Employment	Frequency	Percentage
Full-time employment	756	6.4%
Part-time employment	918	7.8%
Unemployed	1,807	15.3%
Not Applicable	8,216	69.5%

Juvenile's Parental Responsibility	Frequency	Percentage
No children	11,295	95.5%
One child	217	1.8%
Two children	63	0.5%
Three or more children	63	0.5%

Health/Handicaps	Frequency	Percentage
No health problems or physical handicaps	11,189	94.6%
No health problems/handicaps but limited access to health care	150	1.3%
Mild physical handicap or medical condition	294	2.5%
Pregnancy	11	0.1%
Serious physical handicap or medical condition	53	0.4%

Parental Management Style	Frequency	Percentage
Effective management style	5,559	47.0%
Moderately ineffective management style	4,759	40.2%
Severely ineffective management style	1,379	11.7%

Parental Mental Health	Frequency	Percentage
No parental history of mental health disorder	9,099	76.9%
Parental history of mental health disorder	2,598	22.0%

Parental Substance Abuse	Frequency	Percentage
No parental substance abuse	9,122	77.1%
Parental substance abuse	2,575	21.8%

Social Support System	Frequency	Percentage
Strong social support system	6,158	52.1%
Limited support system, with one positive role model	4,454	37.7%
Weak support system; no positive role models	936	7.9%
Strong negative or criminal influence	149	1.3%

*Missing data accounts for 1.1% of referrals.

Section 7: Detention

Missouri's juvenile and family division of the circuit court includes 18 detention facilities to house youth in need of secure detention. Juvenile justice personnel identify offenders most in need of secure detention using the objective criteria contained in Missouri's Juvenile Detention Assessment (JDTA). On February 18, 2014 the Supreme Court of Missouri adopted the "Standards for Operation of a Secure Juvenile Detention Facility" which then became effective on January 1, 2015 that guides detention policy and practices.

Section 7 presents admission, discharge, population, and length of stay information entered on the **Custom Room Facility Assignment (CZAROOM)** form of JIS for Missouri's secure detention facilities. Depending on the reporting objective, counts are based on admissions or discharges; a single youth may be counted multiple times if they were detained on more than one occasion.

Please note that as of August 2021, youth that are certified to stand trial as an adult shall be held in detention facilities. Those youth are separated out from the rest of the detention counts. They are represented in separate charts beginning with Figure 7-16 in this section.

Table 7-1 State Youth Population August 31, 2024

Metropolitan circuits [16, 21, & 22] account for roughly 52% of all youth detained in Missouri on the last day of August 2024.

Circuit	Population	Percent MO Youth Detained
2	4	1.8%
5	5	2.3%
7	8	3.6%
11	7	3.2%
13	20	9.1%
16	17	7.7%
17	3	1.4%
21	64	29.1%
22	33	15.0%
23	7	3.2%
24	5	2.3%
26	8	3.6%
29	2	0.9%
31	11	5.0%
33	6	2.7%
35	9	4.1%
44	11	5.0%
Total	**220**	**100.0%**

Figure 7-1 State Youth Admissions by Sex

There were 2,725 admissions to secure detention facilities in CY24. Males [2,152] accounted for 79% of these admissions. Females accounted for 20% [543].

Missing Data [30]



Figure 7-2 State Youth Admissions by Race

White youth accounted for 45% [1,221] of admissions to secure detention facilities while Black youth accounted for 49% [1,322]. Hispanic youth accounted for 3% [79] of admissions, while Asian/Pacific Islander youth [12] and Native American youth [9] accounted for less than 1% combined.

Missing Data [82]



Figure 7-3 State Youth Admissions by Sex and Race

Among male detainees, Black males accounted for the largest number of admissions to secure detention facilities [51%, 1,106], followed by White males [43%, 933]. Among female detainees, White females accounted for the largest percentage of admissions to a detention center [53%, 288] followed by Black females [39%, 214].

Missing data [82]



Figure 7-4 State Youth Admissions by Age Group

Youth between the ages of 15 and 16 years accounted for the majority of admissions [47%, 1,286], followed by ages 17 years or older [27%, 730]. The age groups of 13-14 [21%, 583] and 12 years or younger [4%, 99] accounted for the lowest percentage of admissions across age groups.

Missing Data [30]



Figure 7-5 State Youth Admissions by Sex and Age Group

Male youth, 15 to 16 years old, represented the greatest number of admissions to detention facilities [37%, 1,010].

Missing Data [30]



Figure 7-6 State Youth Admissions by Race and Age Group

Black youth, 15 to 16 years old, represented the greatest number of admissions to detention facilities [24%, 664], followed by White youth of the same age group [21%, 560].

Missing Data [82]



Figure 7-7 State Youth Average Daily Population by Sex

The statewide average daily detention population was 204 youth. The vast majority [178, 87%] of these detainees were male.

Missing Data [31]



Figure 7-8 State Youth Average Daily Population by Race

The statewide average daily population for Black youth [133] in secure detention was greater than all other youth combined [74].

Missing Data [83]



Figure 7-9 State Youth Average Daily Population by Sex and Race

Within sex, the statewide average daily detention population was greatest for Black males [121]. For the female population, Black detainees also had the highest average daily detention population [13].

Missing Data [83]



Figure 7-10 State Youth Average Daily Population by Age Group

Within age groups, the statewide average daily detention population was greatest for 15-16 year old youth [106], followed by 17 years old or older youth [58]. The average daily population was the lowest for ages 12 and younger [3].

Missing Data [27]



Figure 7-11 State Youth Average and Median Length of Stay by Sex

The statewide average length of stay in detention facilities was 30 days for males and 17 days for females.

Missing Data [21]



Figure 7-12 State Youth Average and Median Length of Stay by Race

Statewide, Black youth had the longest average length of stay of 36 days. Black youth had the longest median length of stay of 15 days.

Missing Data [77]



Figure 7-13 State Youth Average Length of Stay by Sex and Race

The statewide average length of stay was longest for Black males at 39 days. Black females at 22 days was the longest average length of stay amongst females in detention.

Missing Data [77]



Figure 7-14 State Youth Median Length of Stay by Sex and Race

The statewide median length of stay was longest for Black males [17 days]. The second longest median length was for Hispanic males [11 days].

Missing Data [77]



Figure 7-15 State Youth Average and Median Length of Stay by Age Group

Youth 17 years old or older represented the longest average length of stay [29 days]. The average length of stay for the youth 12 years old and younger was the shortest [13 days].

Missing Data [17]



Figure 7-16 Certified Youth Admissions by Sex

There were 53 certified youth admissions to secure detention facilities in CY24. Males [50] accounted for 94% of these admissions. Females accounted for 2% [1].

Missing Data [2]



Figure 7-17 Certified Youth Admissions by Race

White youth accounted for 9% [5] of certified youth admissions to secure detention facilities while Black youth accounted for 81% [43].

Missing Data [4]



Figure 7-18 Certified Youth Admissions by Sex and Race

Among certified male detainees, Black males accounted for the largest number of certified admissions to secure detention facilities [79%, 42], followed by White males [9%, 5]. There was only one female certified youth detained.

Missing Data [4]



Figure 7-19 Certified Youth Admissions by Age Group

Youth 17 years or older [79%, 42] and 15-16 years or younger [19%, 10] accounted for the vast majority of all of certified youth admissions, followed by youth 13-14 years old [2%, 1].

Missing Data [0]



Figure 7-20 Certified Youth Admissions by Sex and Age Group

Male youth, 17 or older, represented the greatest number of certified youth admissions to detention facilities [76%, 40].

Missing Data [2]

Figure 7-21 Certified Youth Admissions by Race and Age Group

Black youth, 17 or older represented the greatest number of certified youth admissions to detention facilities [62%, 33].

Missing Data [4]



Figure 7-22 Certified Youth Average Daily Population by Sex

The statewide average daily detention population was 24 youth. The vast majority [22.1, 93%] of these detainees were male.

Missing Data [2]



Figure 7-23 Certified Youth Average Daily Population by Race

The statewide average daily population for Black youth [19] in secure detention was greater than White youth [4] and Hispanic youth [1].

Missing Data [4]



Figure 7-24 Certified Youth Average Daily Population by Sex and Race

Within sex, the statewide average daily detention population was greatest for black males [18]. For the female population, white detainees had the highest average daily detention population [1].

Missing Data [4]



Figure 7-25 Certified Youth Average Daily Population by Age

Within age groups, the statewide average daily detention population of certified youth was greatest for 15-16-year old youth [11], followed by 17 years old or older youth [10].



Figure 7-26 Certified Youth Average and Median Length of Stay by Sex

The statewide average length of stay in detention facilities for certified youth was 135 days for males and 153 days for females.



Figure 7-27 Certified Youth Average and Median Length of Stay by Race

Statewide, White youth had the longest average length of stay of 320 days, and white youth also had the longest median length of stay of 267 days.



Figure 7-28 Certified Youth Average Length of Stay by Sex and Race

The statewide average length of stay was longest for White males at 267 days, followed by Hispanic males at 183 days.



Figure 7-29 Certified Youth Median Length of Stay by Sex and Race

The statewide median length of stay was longest for White males [320 days]. The second longest median length was for Hispanic males [183 days].



Figure 7-30 Certified Youth Average and Median Length of Stay by Age

Youth between the age of 13-14 years old represented the longest average length of stay [248 days] and longest median length of stay [248 days]



Section 8: Division of Youth Services Commitments

Section 8 presents demographic information on youth committed to the Division of Youth Services (DYS) identified by a docket entry of DDYS – Committed to DYS on the ***Docketing*** tab in ***Show-Me Courts***. For circuit level information on these commitments, refer to Appendix M. Assuming commitments to DYS are entered into ***Show-Me Courts*** only once for a youth, the count is unduplicated.

Figure 8-1 Statewide DYS Commitments by Sex and Race

There were 549 youths committed to the custody of DYS in CY24. The majority [81%, 447] were male. White youth accounted for 54% [296] of juveniles committed to DYS, while black youth accounted for 40% [220].

Missing Data [9]



Figure 8-2 Statewide DYS Commitments by Age Group

Forty-seven percent [258] of youth committed to DYS were between the ages of 15 and 16. An additional 19% [102] were between 13-14 years of age. Youth younger than 12 years accounted for 1% [7], while 33% [182] of youth were aged 17 or older.

Missing Data [0]



Tables 8-1 Statewide DYS Commitments by Sex, Race, and Age Group

White males age 17 [72] were the most common group committed to DYS. White males had more commitments than Black males in every age group except 18 years and older. White females had more commitments than Black females in every age group for CY24.

Missing Data [9]

Male youth

Age/Race	White	Black	Hispanic	Native American	Asian/ Pacific Islander
<=12	3	0	0	0	0
13	16	7	1	0	0
14	33	20	3	0	0
15	52	40	2	0	0
16	57	49	4	0	1
17	72	67	6	0	0
>=18	3	6	0	0	0
Total	**236**	**189**	**16**	**0**	**1**

Female Youth

Age/Race	White	Black	Hispanic	Native American	Asian/ Pacific Islander
<=12	3	1	0	0	0
13	3	2	1	0	0
14	11	2	0	0	0
15	12	6	0	1	0
16	19	11	0	0	0
17	10	7	3	1	1
>=18	2	2	0	0	0
Total	**60**	**31**	**4**	**2**	**1**

Section 9: Certification to Adult Court

Section 9 presents demographic information about youth certified to adult court, identified by the docket entry of DJVCA - JUV Certified to Adult Court on the ***Docketing*** tab in ***Show-Me Courts***. For additional circuit level information about these certifications, refer to Appendix N. Assuming certifications are entered into ***Show-Me Courts*** only once for a youth, the count presented is unduplicated.

The Missouri Juvenile Officer Performance Standards (2017) section 5.4 Certification mandates "the juvenile officer shall consider the implications of certification and consider certification only in circumstances in which issues of public safety cannot be mitigated by supervision and services in the juvenile justice system."

Figure 9-1 Certifications by Sex

The statewide total for offenders certified to adult court was 103. The vast majority were males [95%, 98].

Missing Data [1]



Figure 9-2 Certifications by Race

The percentage of offenders certified to adult court was greater for black youth [73%, 75] than for white youth [22%, 23].

Missing Data [1]



Figure 9-3 Certifications by Age

The largest portions of offenders certified to adult courts were 18 years or older [43%, 44] and 17 years old [38%, 39]. Ten percent [10] were 16 years old and the remaining 10% [10] were 14-15 years old.

Missing Data [0]



Figure 9-4 Certifications Trends by Race

Since 2012, the number of black offenders certified to adult courts has increased 121% and the number of white offenders increased by 15%.

From 2023 to 2024, the total number of certifications increased by 6%. There were 5 offenders of the other races certified in 2024 compared to 0 in 2023.

This data may have been influenced by the raise the age legislation which went into effect July 2021. This legislation allowed juvenile offenders up to the age of 17 to be processed in juvenile courts.



Section 10: Juvenile Offender Recidivism

Juvenile divisions across the country are being asked to provide evidence that public funds are used in cost-effective ways to reduce and prevent juvenile crime. For Missouri juvenile divisions to measure progress in this area, the following statewide definition of juvenile offender recidivism was developed through consensus:

"A juvenile offender recidivist is any youth, referred to the juvenile office for a legally sufficient law violation during a calendar year, who receives one or more legally sufficient law violation(s) to the juvenile or adult court within one year of the initial referral's disposition date."

Section 10 presents the demographic and offense characteristics that influenced recidivism rates for the calendar 2023 cohort of Missouri juvenile law offenders who were tracked through calendar 2024 for recidivism. Note that recidivism is tracked by the offender's party id entered in **Show Me Courts** and is only tracked if the new offense occurs in the same circuit as the original offense.

Figure 10-1 Missouri Youth Offender Population

Approximately 0.8% [8,469] of the 1,026,656 juveniles aged 5-17 were referred to Missouri's juvenile and family division for legally sufficient law violation referrals in CY23.



Figure 10-2 Percentage of Youth Recidivating (All Law)

Approximately 22% [1,860] of the 8,469 juvenile law offenders in CY23 recidivated through a new law violation within one year of the disposition date of their initial referral.



Figure 10-3 Percentage of Youth Recidivating (Misdemeanor A or Felony)

Roughly 16% [1,361] of the 8,469 juvenile law offenders in CY23 recidivated either with a new Class A misdemeanor or felony offense within one year of the disposition date of their initial referral.



Figure 10-4 Percentage of Youth Recidivating (Felony)

Eight percent [708] of the 8,469 juvenile law offenders in CY23 recidivated with a felony offense within one year of the disposition date of their initial referral.



Figure 10-5 Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Year

The percentage of the recidivists with any law violation increased by 0.6% between the 2022 cohort and the 2023 cohort. The percent of youth who recidivated with either a Class A misdemeanor or felony increased by 1.0% from CY22 cohort. The percentage of youth recidivating with a felony increased by 0.3% from CY22 cohort.



Figure 10-6 Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Sex

Males [24.0%, 1,427] from the CY23 cohort recidivated at a higher rate than their female [17.8%, 432] counterparts. This holds true for those who recidivated with either Class A misdemeanor or felony offense, as well as for those who recidivated with only a felony offense.



Figure 10-7 Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Race

Proportionately, black youth [27%, 754] from the CY23 cohort had a higher rate of recidivism than their other minority counterparts [19%, 63] and white counterparts [20%, 1,043] for all law referrals. The same holds true for referrals for felonies with class A misdemeanors, as well as all felony charges.



Figure 10-8 Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Circuit Type

Recidivism from CY23 for all law violations was higher for youth in multi-county circuits [23.0%, 1,057] than for youth in single county circuits, [20.7%, 803]. However, the percentages were higher for Class A misdemeanors and felonies [16.6%, 642] in single county circuits than in multi-county circuits [15.7%, 719], and also higher for just felony referrals in single county circuits [9.2%, 357] than in multi-county circuits [7.6%, 351].



Figure 10-9 Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Age

The percentage of recidivism is highest for youth between the ages of 13 and 14 years for all types of offenses, except felony only charges. Proportionally, youth 15-16 years old had a higher recidivism rate for felonies [9%, 313].



Section 11: Racial and Ethnic Disparity (RED)

RED is one of four core requirements of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended in 2002. All states are required by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) to make efforts to document and reduce RED. The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act was reauthorized in 2018, also known as the Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2018. One of its key components is to further determine if there are racial and ethnic disparities (RED) identified within in the juvenile justice system and actively work to address those issues by identifying and analyzing data on race and ethnicity at decision points in State, local or tribal juvenile justice systems to determine which such points create racial and ethnic disparities among youth who come into contact with the juvenile justice system.

Disproportionate minority contact occurs whenever the overall volume of activity for minority youth at various juvenile justice contact points is disproportionately larger than the volume of activity for white youth at those points. It is important to examine *all* juvenile justice contact points due to the likelihood that minority youth will penetrate deeper into the juvenile justice system as a result of disproportionate minority contact with the system. Racial and ethnic disparities further involve the unfair or inequitable treatment of youth of color at those decision points in the juvenile justice system due to various reasons.

The existence of disproportionality does not necessarily mean that minority youth are experiencing disparity (or unequal treatment), because further analysis is needed to determine whether or not disproportionality is a consequence of disparities and/or other contributing mechanisms.

The Missouri Juvenile Officer Performance Standards (2017) section 1.15 Antidiscrimination and Disproportionate Minority Contact mandates “the juvenile officer shall prohibit discrimination and proactively address racial and ethnic disparities to ensure fundamental fairness and equal justice for those served by the juvenile office.”

What is a Relative Rate Index (RRI)?

The data analysis of the OJJDP Relative Rate Index (RRI) compares the relative volume of activity (rate) for eight court contact points for each minority youth group with the volume of activity (rate) for the majority group (white youth). It provides a single index number that indicates the extent to which the volume of contact differs.

Because the Relative Rate Index is intended to capture the overall extent of youth involvement with the juvenile justice system, the RRI calculation is based on *cases*, not individual *youth*. If a youth is referred to the juvenile court multiple times during the course of a single year, all of those referrals are included. Therefore, the data provided include ***duplicated*** counts for all court contact points.

Example: The RRI comparing rates of referral to juvenile court:

Rate of Referral for black youth:

# of black youth referred:	150 = 0.30 X 1000 = 300
# of black youth in population	500

Rate of Referral for white youth:

# of white youth referred:	200 = 0.04 X 1000 = 40
# of white youth in population	5000

Relative Rate Calculation for Referrals:

Rate of Referral for black youth:	300 = **7.5 RRI**
Rate of Referral for white youth	40

If the RRI is larger than 1.0, that means that the minority group experiences contact more often than white youth. If it is less than 1.0, that means that contact is less frequent. In this example, the RRI for black referrals is 7.5. This means that black youth are seven and a half times more likely to be referred to the juvenile office than white youth.

With the exception of the first rate (referral), which is calculated using the base of the number of youth in each major racial/ethnic grouping in the general population, each of the subsequent RRIs is calculated based on the volume of activity for that racial/ethnic group in a proceeding stage in the case process. See Table 11-1.

Table 11-1 Identifying the Numerical Bases for Rate Calculations

Decision Stage / Contact Point	Base for Rates
Referrals to Juvenile Court	Rate per 1,000 Population
Referrals Diverted	Rate per 100 Referrals
Referrals Involving Secure Detention	Rate per 100 Referrals
Referrals Petitioned	Rate per 100 Referrals
Referrals Resulting in Delinquency Findings	Rate per 100 Petitions
Referrals Resulting in Supervision / Probation Placement	Rate per 100 Delinquency Findings
Referrals Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities	Rate per 100 Delinquency Findings
Referrals Transferred to Adult Court	Rate per 100 Petitions Filed

Table 11-2 Relative Rate Index (RRI) Values

More than 1.00	Referrals to Juvenile Court Referrals Involving Secure Detention Referrals Petitioned Referrals Resulting in Delinquency Findings Referrals Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities Referrals Transferred to Adult Court
Less than 1.00	Referrals Diverted Referrals Resulting in Supervision / Probation Placement

Note: RRI values that cause RED concern can be greater than 1.00 or less than 1.00.

What Data are Used?

- U.S. Census data for youth ages 10-17 in all counties in Missouri.
- Census data from the previous calendar year was used, because the Census population updates for the current year are not available at the time of publication.
- Office of State Courts Administrator delinquency data in the Judicial Information System (JIS). Law violation referrals and status referrals (but not child abuse and neglect referrals) were included.
- Transfers to other juvenile court referrals were not included

Table 11-3 Statewide Relative Rate Indices

Black youth experienced the largest disproportionality overall. Black youth were over-represented at referral, while Hispanic and Asian /Pacific Islander youth were under-represented at that contact point. Black youth also experienced negative disproportionality at: diversion, secure detention, petition, delinquent findings, supervision, and cases transferred to adult court (certification).

Contact Point	Black	Hispanic	Asian / Pacific Islander	Native American
Referral	**2.32**	**0.35**	**0.29**	*
Diversion	**0.92**	0.97	1.01	*
Secure Detention	**1.74**	**1.58**	0.63	*
Petition	**1.49**	**1.25**	0.81	*
Delinquent Findings	**0.90**	0.97	**	*
Supervision	**0.88**	0.75	**	*
Secure Confinement	0.93	1.13	**	*
Certification	**4.44**	**	**	*

Statistically significant results **Bold Font**

Group is less than 1% of youth population *

Insufficient number of cases for analysis **

Note: Caution should be used when interpreting the Hispanic data, because race and ethnicity are not separated in ***Show-Me Courts***. Thus, Hispanic youth are under-counted.

Figure 11-1 Ten-Year Trend of Statewide RRI for Referrals of Black Youth

While the number of referrals has declined over the last decade, the RRI for referrals of black youth has remained relatively steady with the highest in 2024 at 2.3 and the lowest in 2018 and 2021 at 1.9. The reason for this is that, although the total number of referrals are lower than in 2015, they have not declined evenly across race/ethnicity groups.



Section 12: Juvenile Officer Workload

The Juvenile Officer Weighted Workload (JOWWL) system is an automated means of estimating the direct service need for additional deputy juvenile officers in Missouri's 35 multi-county circuits. The JOWWL compares the number of staff hours required to screen and process the status, law, and CA/N referrals received by juvenile divisions and to supervise youth in accordance with the ***Missouri Juvenile Officer Performance Standards,*** against the actual number of staff hours available to complete these direct service activities. When workload demand exceeds the number of staff hours available to meet it, a need for additional direct service personnel is projected. The Circuit Court Budget Committee (CCBC) adopted and first used the results of the JOWWL for estimating FTE needs for juvenile officers in fiscal 2004. The CCBC has since used the JOWWL annually for this budgetary purpose. In January of 2020 a workload study was conducted by the National Center for State Courts, and a model was delivered the summer of 2020. The model adjusted workload weights for various case processing activities and eliminated the Alternatives to Detention case processing category.

Example of Workload Estimate for Mock Multi-County Circuit

Annual Case-Specific Workload: Annual total work minutes required to service juvenile cases at established standards includes screening, processing and supervising delinquency and CA/N cases, based on workload values identified by the 2020 juvenile officer workload study [Table 12-1].

Example: Mock Circuit, 255,314 minutes of direct service work are required to accommodate case management demand.

Staffing Demand: Total number of direct service staff needed to meet Annual Case-Specific Workload. (Annual available work minutes per Juvenile Office is 75,761)

Example: Mock Circuit, Total Annual Case-Specific Workload / 75,761 mnts. = Staffing Demand (255,314 /75,761 mnts. = 3.4 direct service staff needed).

Circuit FTE: Total number of direct service staff currently employed by circuit.

Example: Mock Circuit employs 2 direct service staff. Currently this includes all state-paid DJO I, II & III positions and all full-time staff paid through DYS diversion grant funds.

FTE Need: Additional direct service staff needed to service Total Workload Hours per standards.

Example: Mock Circuit, Staffing Demand – Circuit FTE = FTE Need (3.4 - 2.0 = 1.4 additional direct service staff).

Table 12-1 Workload Values per Year from Juvenile Officer Workload Study (2020)

Diversion

Column Description	Workload Value (Minutes)
Diversion	639.24

Status Cases

Column Description	Workload Value (Minutes)
Screening (Informal/formal)	1243.58
Informal Processing	4521.62
Informal Supervision	1021.78
Formal Processing	5040.46
Formal Supervision: All risk levels	2084.64
Truancy Court	1849.89

Law Cases

Column Description	Workload Value (Minutes)
Screening (Informal/formal)	1522.67
Informal Processing	4838.43
Informal Supervision	783.48
Formal Processing	16761.28
Formal Supervision: All risk levels	3296.88
Juvenile Treatment Court	2116.20

Child Abuse and Neglect (CA/N) Cases

Column Description	Workload Value (Minutes)
Screening (Informal/formal)	1383
Informal Processing	8942.14
Informal Supervision	1125.96
Formal Processing	13055.17
Formal Supervision and out-of-home placement	367.30
Protections Orders	261.60
Family Treatment Court	873.07

Termination of Parental Rights (TPR) Cases

Column Description	Workload Value (Minutes)
Screening	1333.13
Court Related Activity	1333.13

Table 12-2 Juvenile Officer Weighted Workload



Section 13: CA/N Time Standards

In March 2005, the Supreme Court of Missouri issued an order adopting Court Operating Rule (COR) 23.01, Reporting Requirements for Child Abuse and Neglect Cases, effective July 1, 2005. This COR requires the presiding judge in each circuit to submit a quarterly report (CA/N Quarterly) to OSCA. The CA/N Quarterly Report lists all child abuse and neglect hearings where standards were not met during the quarter. These standards are based on the requirements of Supreme Court Rule 124.01, Rules of Practice and Procedure in Juvenile Divisions and Family Court Divisions of the Circuit, which states that the following hearings shall be held:

1) Within three days, excluding Saturday, Sunday and legal holidays, a protective custody hearing
2) Within 60 days, an adjudication hearing
3) Within 90 days, a dispositional hearing
4) Every 90 to 120 days after the dispositional hearing during the first 12 months in which the juvenile is in the custody of the children's division, a dispositional review hearing
5) Within 12 months and at least annually thereafter, a permanency hearing
6) As often as necessary after each permanency hearing, but at least every six months, during the period in which the juvenile remains in the custody of the children's division, a permanency review hearing.

The data from each circuit is compiled into a final report and submitted to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Missouri and the Commission on Retirement, Removal and Discipline

The Missouri Juvenile Officer Performance Standards (2017) section 5.7 Timeliness of Proceedings and Applicable Time Standards mandates "the juvenile officer shall ensure the timely scheduling of all hearings and not be a party to undue and unnecessary delays. Further, the juvenile officer shall comply with established time standards in the scheduling of hearings to the extent such is in control of the juvenile officer and serves the interest of justice."

Table 13-1 CA/N Hearings Held Timely

In FY24, the juvenile and family divisions conducted the required CA/N hearings in a timely fashion. Thirty-eight circuits held 95% or more of their hearings on time; while at the statewide level, 95% of hearings were held timely.

Table is continued on the next page.

Circuit	Hearings Held	Hearings Held Timely	Percent Held Timely
1	299	299	100%
2	745	735	99%
3	139	135	97%
4	406	404	100%
5	564	564	100%
6	231	213	92%
7	677	656	97%
8	30	29	97%
9	301	294	98%
10	757	681	90%
11	979	932	95%
12	614	614	100%
13	1,597	1,540	96%
14	603	524	87%
15	174	174	100%
16	3,291	2,251	68%
17	654	652	100%
18	363	363	100%
19	485	481	99%
20	1,141	1,112	97%
21	4,172	3,940	94%
22	2,669	2,545	95%
23	1,855	1,803	97%

Circuit	Hearings Held	Hearings Held Timely	Percent Held Timely
24	1,809	1,741	96%
25	2,078	2,072	100%
26	1,153	1,153	100%
27	601	587	98%
28	418	413	99%
29	1,340	1,338	100%
30	785	777	99%
31	2,732	2,731	100%
32	781	753	96%
33	543	541	100%
34	667	640	96%
35	1,017	992	98%
36	1,064	963	91%
37	377	375	99%
38	485	485	100%
39	996	996	100%
40	976	903	93%
41	268	267	100%
42	1,218	1,163	95%
43	603	513	85%
44	551	543	99%
45	533	512	96%
46	834	834	100%
Statewide	**44,575**	**42,233**	**95%**

Section 14: Juvenile and Family Division Programs and Diversion

Juvenile Officers across the state of Missouri provide a variety of programming to youth and their families on a daily basis to address their particular risk and needs. These programs are intended to decrease recidivism, promote accountability, enhance community safety, enhance child and family safety, and teach prosocial behaviors. The programs detailed below are programs that have been documented in the Justice Information System.

The Missouri Juvenile Officer Performance Standards (2017) section 2.4 Diversion mandates "the juvenile officer shall utilize evidence-based diversion programming whenever appropriate." Section 3.13 Specialized Services and Treatment mandates "the juvenile officer shall provide specialized services and treatment specific to the offense, gender, and culture of the juvenile to the extent practicable based on available resources."

These programs are categorized into several main areas listed below:

- **Accountability Programs:** These programs primarily try to teach youth how to take responsibility for their actions and empower them to develop more prosocial behaviors at home, school, and in the community.

- **Alternative Court Programs:** These are specialty court dockets or programs that are meant to address a specific problem area for youth and provide accountability, education, and resources for a specific issue.

- **Anger Management/Conflict Resolution Programs:** These programs are meant to teach youth how to effectively identify their anger and manage it appropriately in a variety of social settings.

- **Diversionary Programs:** Diversionary Programs are programs that are meant to divert youth from various entry points into the juvenile justice system. Diversion programs are divided into four levels based on the time that the offense is committed by the juvenile and when the juvenile participates in the program.

    - Level one diversion programs are used to completely prevent unnecessary referrals from coming to the juvenile office.

    - Level two diversion programs are used when the actions of a juvenile could result in a referral to the juvenile officer.

- Level three diversion programs divert youth referred to the juvenile court from formal court action into appropriate community based programs.

- Level four diversion programs divert youth referred to the juvenile office from secure confinement or commitment to the Missouri Division of Youth Services so that they can remain in the community.

- **Gender Specific Programs:** These programs provide prosocial interventions and education specific to the needs of boys or girls that are involved with the juvenile justice system.

- **Health and Fitness Programs**: These programs are meant to promote the overall health and well-being of youth referred to the juvenile justice system.
- **Mental Health Programs:** These programs provide a variety of mental health services to a youth or their family that address both the internal and external issues that may be contributing to problematic behaviors by youth.
- **Monitoring Programs:** These programs primarily monitor the whereabouts and activities of youth to promote community safety according to a youth's risk level.
- **Parenting Education and Support Programs:** These programs are meant to provide education, resources, and support to parents or guardians whose children are involved in either the juvenile justice system or child welfare system.
- **Problem Sexual Behavior and Offending Programs:** These programs are meant to provide education and support to youth referred to the court for problem sexual behaviors or sex offenses to try to prevent re-offense and promote more prosocial thought patterns.
- **Prosocial Juvenile Programs:** These programs created by juvenile officers are innovative and may fit into several categories.
- **School and Academic Related Programs:** These are programs that are meant to promote success for youth in school and the educational setting.

- **Sexual Education Programs:** These programs are meant to provide overall education and support to youth involved with the court to improve their health and who are at risk for pregnancy, sexual violence or receiving a sexually transmitted infection.

- **Substance Abuse Programs:** These are programs that are meant to provide education, treatment, and support to youth who have been referred for substance related offenses or identify as having a substance abuse problem.

- **Victim Education and Restorative Justice Programs:** These are programs that are meant to provide education to youth regarding the impact of their offense on the victim and promote empathy for the victim. These programs further provide services that are meant to restore for the victim what has been done wrong by the juvenile.

- **Vocational and Life Skills Development Programs:** These are programs that meant to teach youth skills that can help them demonstrate socially appropriate behaviors and gain and retain employment in the community.

Table 14-1 Juvenile Program Categories and the number of Participants

In CY24, there were 11,619 juveniles that participated in court sponsored programs. Monitoring was the most frequently used program category with participants [2,482, 21%]. Victim Education and Restorative Justice [2,164, 19%], Vocational or Life Skills [1,442 13%], and Mental Health [1,399, 12%], were the other most common program categories.

Missing Data [0]

Juvenile Program Categories	Number of Participants	Percent of Total
Accountability	942	8.1%
Alternative Court	608	5.2%
Anger Management / Conflict Resolution	288	2.5%
Gender Specific	193	1.7%
Health and Fitness	103	0.9%
Mental Health	1,399	12.0%
Monitoring	2,482	21.4%
Parenting Education and Support	299	2.6%
Problem Sexual Behavior and Offending	24	0.2%
Prosocial Activities	390	3.4%
School or Academic Support	417	3.6%
Sex Education	23	0.2%
Substance Abuse	845	7.3%
Victim Education and Restorative Justice	2,164	18.6%
Vocational and Life Skills Development	1,442	12.4%
Grand Total	**11,619**	**100.0%**

Table 14-2 Juvenile Diversion Programs and the number of participants

In CY24, Juvenile Diversion Programs served 6,730 youth. A youth could have participated in more than one diversion program.

Level 1 Diversion programs were the most commonly used with 4,297 participants [64%] followed by Level 2 diversion programs with 2,160 participants [32%].

Note: Diversion level 1 and 2 counts are only reported in multi-county circuits. They report their counts for credit in the Juvenile Officer Weighted Workload model. Diversion 3 & 4 counts are captured through specific program codes entered in the JIS system. Those codes could be entered statewide.

Circuits might be participating in a diversion program but not reporting those counts to the Office of State Courts Administrator. Those counts will not be reflected in the following table.

Missing Data [0]

Juvenile Diversion Programs CY24	**Number of Participants**	**Percent of Total**
Level 1	4,297	63.8%
Level 2	2,160	32.1%
Level 3 and 4	273	4.1%
Total	**6,730**	**100.0%**

Appendix A: Total Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Juvenile Certified	Informal without Supervsion	Informal With Supervsion	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
1	**0**	**22**	**32**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**13**	**33**	**87**	**3**	**35**	**42**	**271**
Clark	0	15	16	0	0	3	0	8	17	48	1	12	29	149
Schuyler	0	3	7	0	0	1	0	1	4	20	2	5	3	46
Scotland	0	4	9	0	0	0	0	4	12	19	0	18	10	76
2	**0**	**66**	**12**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**99**	**34**	**13**	**45**	**21**	**290**
Adair	0	43	8	0	0	0	0	0	59	12	8	28	9	167
Knox	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	0	8	2	29
Lewis	0	19	4	0	0	0	0	0	25	22	5	9	10	94
3	**0**	**40**	**13**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**26**	**104**	**55**	**6**	**106**	**106**	**457**
Grundy	0	22	8	0	0	0	0	16	62	30	0	58	46	242
Harrison	0	11	2	0	0	0	1	1	19	7	3	23	29	96
Mercer	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	6	4	18
Putnam	0	7	1	0	0	0	0	9	21	14	3	19	27	101
4	**0**	**51**	**18**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**148**	**142**	**5**	**11**	**42**	**100**	**519**
Atchison	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	18	9	1	0	6	9	53
Gentry	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	5	24	0	0	0	6	40
Holt	0	8	1	1	1	0	0	21	15	0	2	7	24	80
Nodaway	0	29	15	0	0	0	0	104	91	4	9	28	60	340
Worth	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	1	6
5	**5**	**76**	**71**	**0**	**4**	**7**	**5**	**235**	**196**	**35**	**2**	**99**	**22**	**757**
Andrew	0	9	6	0	1	0	0	11	31	0	0	7	4	69
Buchanan	5	67	65	0	3	7	5	224	165	35	2	92	18	688
6	**0**	**25**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**1**	**31**	**160**	**56**	**38**	**0**	**59**	**375**
Platte	0	25	2	0	0	3	1	31	160	56	38	0	59	375
7	**1**	**124**	**8**	**0**	**0**	**19**	**5**	**172**	**168**	**13**	**40**	**7**	**199**	**756**
Clay	1	124	8	0	0	19	5	172	168	13	40	7	199	756
8	**1**	**10**	**7**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**89**	**51**	**37**	**5**	**0**	**0**	**200**
Carroll	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	13	6	5	0	0	0	28
Ray	1	7	6	0	0	0	0	76	45	32	5	0	0	172
9	**1**	**30**	**7**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**22**	**14**	**54**	**3**	**23**	**59**	**215**
Chariton	0	9	5	1	0	0	0	4	3	9	0	6	18	55
Linn	1	18	1	1	0	0	0	10	6	16	2	12	32	99
Sullivan	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	8	5	29	1	5	9	61
10	**89**	**26**	**9**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**53**	**31**	**1**	**1**	**4**	**63**	**279**
Marion	89	15	6	2	0	0	0	40	17	1	1	4	56	231
Monroe	0	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	12
Ralls	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	13	12	0	0	0	7	36
11	**95**	**138**	**75**	**0**	**2**	**12**	**2**	**144**	**341**	**133**	**198**	**3**	**241**	**1,384**
St. Charles	95	138	75	0	2	12	2	144	341	133	198	3	241	1,384
12	**0**	**88**	**36**	**0**	**1**	**15**	**0**	**84**	**145**	**232**	**38**	**135**	**33**	**807**
Audrain	0	34	13	0	1	15	0	15	66	137	15	18	13	327
Montgomery	0	18	12	0	0	0	0	33	43	34	5	67	4	216
Warren	0	36	11	0	0	0	0	36	36	61	18	50	16	264

Appendix A: Total Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Juvenile Certified	Informal without Supervsion	Informal With Supervsion	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
13	**1**	**200**	**277**	**33**	**0**	**21**	**0**	**537**	**144**	**773**	**125**	**42**	**55**	**2,208**
Boone	1	139	169	33	0	19	0	487	89	496	80	20	41	1,574
Callaway	0	61	108	0	0	2	0	50	55	277	45	22	14	634
14	**0**	**137**	**54**	**0**	**1**	**8**	**0**	**37**	**86**	**295**	**37**	**172**	**52**	**879**
Howard	0	32	8	0	0	1	0	15	12	45	9	30	4	156
Randolph	0	105	46	0	1	7	0	22	74	250	28	142	48	723
15	**0**	**37**	**23**	**0**	**0**	**6**	**0**	**124**	**79**	**229**	**10**	**37**	**75**	**620**
Lafayette	0	12	14	0	0	6	0	25	19	201	0	37	42	356
Saline	0	25	9	0	0	0	0	99	60	28	10	0	33	264
16	**497**	**338**	**160**	**6**	**11**	**131**	**12**	**13**	**16**	**4**	**16**	**114**	**940**	**2,258**
Jackson	497	338	160	6	11	131	12	13	16	4	16	114	940	2,258
17	**11**	**192**	**182**	**8**	**9**	**37**	**2**	**459**	**268**	**440**	**25**	**1**	**77**	**1,711**
Cass	11	111	112	5	8	37	2	289	193	372	11	1	39	1,191
Johnson	0	81	70	3	1	0	0	170	75	68	14	0	38	520
18	**1**	**46**	**46**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**110**	**179**	**270**	**14**	**49**	**85**	**808**
Cooper	1	32	20	0	1	0	0	51	87	158	1	21	44	416
Pettis	0	14	26	2	1	2	2	59	92	112	13	28	41	392
19	**0**	**58**	**12**	**1**	**2**	**72**	**1**	**10**	**18**	**190**	**66**	**38**	**56**	**524**
Cole	0	58	12	1	2	72	1	10	18	190	66	38	56	524
20	**10**	**131**	**25**	**0**	**0**	**16**	**0**	**86**	**128**	**102**	**42**	**10**	**49**	**599**
Franklin	10	96	19	0	0	15	0	76	105	97	31	10	43	502
Gasconade	0	18	1	0	0	1	0	5	14	3	6	0	1	49
Osage	0	17	5	0	0	0	0	5	9	2	5	0	5	48
21	**264**	**274**	**105**	**118**	**191**	**31**	**30**	**381**	**276**	**1,174**	**593**	**25**	**1,540**	**5,002**
St. Louis Co.	264	274	105	118	191	31	30	381	276	1,174	593	25	1,540	5,002
22	**72**	**292**	**87**	**1**	**1**	**84**	**17**	**1**	**63**	**81**	**127**	**0**	**640**	**1,466**
St. Louis City	72	292	87	1	1	84	17	1	63	81	127	0	640	1,466
23	**50**	**208**	**116**	**0**	**0**	**102**	**0**	**287**	**179**	**581**	**52**	**29**	**153**	**1,757**
Jefferson	50	208	116	0	0	102	0	287	179	581	52	29	153	1,757
24	**12**	**160**	**39**	**0**	**2**	**25**	**3**	**186**	**46**	**218**	**25**	**21**	**53**	**790**
Madison	0	15	11	0	0	2	0	5	0	15	1	2	11	62
St. Francois	12	79	9	0	1	11	1	112	40	125	12	11	15	428
St. Genevieve	0	27	7	0	0	3	0	28	3	46	10	4	5	133
Washington	0	39	12	0	1	9	2	41	3	32	2	4	22	167
25	**4**	**226**	**21**	**0**	**1**	**13**	**2**	**836**	**122**	**0**	**24**	**527**	**135**	**1,911**
Maries	0	7	0	0	0	1	0	7	1	0	0	4	7	27
Phelps	4	92	12	0	1	6	1	147	20	0	0	90	85	458
Pulaski	0	102	6	0	0	3	1	535	83	0	4	232	42	1,008
Texas	0	25	3	0	0	3	0	147	18	0	20	201	1	418

Appendix A: Total Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Juvenile Certified	Informal without Supervsion	Informal With Supervsion	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
26	**0**	**138**	**22**	**21**	**1**	**16**	**0**	**124**	**198**	**435**	**28**	**94**	**159**	**1,236**
Camden	0	15	6	5	1	0	0	24	46	75	9	62	18	261
Laclede	0	47	11	0	0	0	0	66	105	157	8	13	80	487
Miller	0	34	1	16	0	0	0	20	22	97	9	18	32	249
Moniteau	0	5	0	0	0	3	0	5	7	30	2	1	9	62
Morgan	0	37	4	0	0	13	0	9	18	76	0	0	20	177
27	**0**	**78**	**27**	**1**	**2**	**12**	**0**	**172**	**240**	**174**	**34**	**37**	**31**	**808**
Bates	0	18	3	0	0	1	0	69	56	38	6	8	6	205
Benton	0	37	17	0	2	0	0	41	51	11	0	8	3	170
Henry	0	20	3	0	0	11	0	44	88	88	21	16	7	298
St. Clair	0	3	4	1	0	0	0	18	45	37	7	5	15	135
28	**0**	**18**	**39**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**399**	**62**	**144**	**32**	**42**	**75**	**813**
Barton	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	63	19	7	0	5	1	101
Cedar	0	1	9	0	0	0	0	75	14	27	9	16	10	161
Dade	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	3	10	1	1	2	48
Vernon	0	13	28	0	0	2	0	230	26	100	22	20	62	503
29	**2**	**148**	**81**	**7**	**1**	**6**	**1**	**64**	**18**	**148**	**3**	**13**	**39**	**531**
Jasper	2	148	81	7	1	6	1	64	18	148	3	13	39	531
30	**0**	**90**	**33**	**12**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**5**	**70**	**192**	**80**	**256**	**162**	**900**
Dallas	0	13	8	1	0	0	0	1	11	41	7	63	30	175
Hickory	0	8	0	2	0	0	0	1	4	8	8	3	7	41
Polk	0	28	11	9	0	0	0	1	38	81	53	51	73	345
Webster	0	41	14	0	0	0	0	2	17	62	12	139	52	339
31	**1**	**346**	**60**	**0**	**2**	**89**	**6**	**27**	**42**	**86**	**21**	**13**	**43**	**736**
Greene	1	346	60	0	2	89	6	27	42	86	21	13	43	736
32	**1**	**80**	**72**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**178**	**497**	**529**	**12**	**67**	**88**	**1,524**
Bollinger	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	50	71	0	18	17	160
Cape Girardeau	1	80	60	0	0	0	0	175	302	365	8	42	47	1,080
Perry	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	2	145	93	4	7	24	284
33	**0**	**88**	**17**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**88**	**106**	**6**	**32**	**38**	**104**	**481**
Mississippi	0	52	6	0	0	0	0	15	18	1	2	7	14	115
Scott	0	36	11	0	0	0	2	73	88	5	30	31	90	366
34	**0**	**84**	**29**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**170**	**111**	**7**	**1**	**81**	**85**	**568**
New Madrid	0	31	14	0	0	0	0	60	45	2	1	27	21	201
Pemiscot	0	53	15	0	0	0	0	110	66	5	0	54	64	367
35	**53**	**111**	**26**	**0**	**0**	**46**	**1**	**116**	**176**	**281**	**18**	**99**	**10**	**937**
Dunklin	51	25	10	0	0	8	0	2	19	281	6	0	2	404
Stoddard	2	86	16	0	0	38	1	114	157	0	12	99	8	533
36	**0**	**126**	**82**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**47**	**74**	**236**	**30**	**46**	**86**	**729**
Butler	0	97	74	0	0	1	0	39	68	215	29	37	77	637
Carter	0	4	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	1	6	6	32
Ripley	0	25	3	1	0	0	0	7	5	13	0	3	3	60

Appendix A: Total Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Juvenile Certified	Informal without Supervsion	Informal With Supervsion	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
37	**0**	**51**	**24**	**0**	**0**	**8**	**0**	**113**	**48**	**92**	**9**	**72**	**71**	**488**
Howell	0	31	13	0	0	7	0	102	32	72	8	42	43	350
Oregon	0	10	11	0	0	0	0	3	7	14	1	19	20	85
Shannon	0	10	0	0	0	1	0	8	9	6	0	11	8	53
38	**0**	**119**	**43**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**287**	**157**	**110**	**134**	**140**	**135**	**1,126**
Christian	0	119	43	0	0	1	0	287	157	110	134	140	135	1,126
39	**0**	**76**	**15**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**348**	**58**	**287**	**18**	**16**	**70**	**889**
Barry	0	23	13	0	1	0	0	170	27	70	2	0	33	339
Lawrence	0	32	1	0	0	0	0	116	21	107	10	6	33	326
Stone	0	21	1	0	0	0	0	62	10	110	6	10	4	224
40	**7**	**154**	**43**	**0**	**4**	**37**	**1**	**106**	**203**	**117**	**23**	**205**	**137**	**1,037**
McDonald	2	67	28	0	3	10	1	76	141	20	0	47	23	418
Newton	5	87	15	0	1	27	0	30	62	97	23	158	114	619
41	**1**	**30**	**7**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**50**	**81**	**18**	**2**	**2**	**17**	**211**
Macon	0	26	5	3	0	0	0	34	35	11	1	1	13	129
Shelby	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	16	46	7	1	1	4	82
42	**8**	**157**	**10**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**103**	**95**	**3**	**34**	**12**	**422**
Crawford	0	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	3	2	2	9	58
Dent	4	47	5	0	0	0	0	0	64	44	0	0	0	164
Iron	1	31	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	2	0	19	0	63
Reynolds	1	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	1	3	1	51
Wayne	2	24	3	0	0	0	0	0	18	27	0	10	2	86
43	**10**	**74**	**15**	**2**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**15**	**55**	**50**	**33**	**62**	**119**	**437**
Caldwell	5	11	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	9	2	17	6	62
Clinton	3	10	4	1	0	0	1	3	11	19	5	15	12	84
Daviess	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	9	8	4	44
DeKalb	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	3	7	13	35
Livingston	0	39	8	1	0	1	0	7	29	14	14	15	84	212
44	**0**	**64**	**6**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**5**	**59**	**5**	**0**	**37**	**14**	**192**
Douglas	0	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	11	1	0	7	2	37
Ozark	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	1	0	3	1	20
Wright	0	46	3	1	0	0	0	3	41	3	0	27	11	135
45	**5**	**27**	**22**	**1**	**0**	**3**	**1**	**52**	**67**	**212**	**21**	**109**	**190**	**710**
Lincoln	5	24	20	1	0	3	0	48	63	172	17	107	165	625
Pike	0	3	2	0	0	0	1	4	4	40	4	2	25	85
46	**7**	**136**	**16**	**1**	**0**	**6**	**0**	**119**	**77**	**85**	**18**	**37**	**29**	**531**
Taney	7	136	16	1	0	6	0	119	77	85	18	37	29	531
Statewide Total	**1,209**	**5,190**	**2,126**	**225**	**239**	**836**	**96**	**6,569**	**5,590**	**8,408**	**2,066**	**3,064**	**6,531**	**42,149**

Appendix B: Law Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Juvenile Certified	Informal without Supervison	Informal with Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
1	**0**	**0**	**17**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**1**	**7**	**9**	**1**	**0**	**4**	**42**
Clark	0	0	10	0	0	2	0	1	7	4	0	0	2	26
Schuyler	0	0	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	1	0	1	13
Scotland	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3
2	**0**	**0**	**9**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**25**	**10**	**7**	**5**	**9**	**65**
Adair	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	19	3	4	4	5	41
Knox	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lewis	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	3	1	4	24
3	**0**	**9**	**10**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**3**	**23**	**10**	**2**	**9**	**16**	**83**
Grundy	0	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	12	5	0	5	5	42
Harrison	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	0	0	5	12
Mercer	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	4
Putnam	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	3	2	3	6	25
4	**0**	**4**	**11**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7**	**47**	**0**	**1**	**3**	**12**	**85**
Atchison	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Gentry	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	1	7
Holt	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Nodaway	0	1	9	0	0	0	0	7	38	0	1	3	11	70
Worth	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
5	**2**	**25**	**49**	**0**	**3**	**6**	**5**	**90**	**18**	**17**	**1**	**14**	**13**	**243**
Andrew	0	1	6	0	1	0	0	4	2	0	0	2	1	17
Buchanan	2	24	43	0	2	6	5	86	16	17	1	12	12	226
6	**0**	**7**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**1**	**22**	**141**	**39**	**34**	**0**	**43**	**290**
Platte	0	7	1	0	0	2	1	22	141	39	34	0	43	290
7	**0**	**19**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**10**	**5**	**165**	**149**	**11**	**37**	**7**	**3**	**410**
Clay	0	19	4	0	0	10	5	165	149	11	37	7	3	410
8	**1**	**3**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**31**	**16**	**6**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**63**
Carroll	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	3	2	0	0	0	14
Ray	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	24	13	4	3	0	0	49
9	**0**	**3**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**9**	**18**
Chariton	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Linn	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	8	14
Sullivan	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
10	**31**	**4**	**6**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**22**	**14**	**1**	**1**	**3**	**45**	**129**
Marion	31	1	3	2	0	0	0	16	10	1	1	3	41	109
Monroe	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Ralls	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	0	0	0	4	16
11	**19**	**15**	**67**	**0**	**2**	**6**	**2**	**107**	**287**	**55**	**156**	**2**	**199**	**917**
St. Charles	19	15	67	0	2	6	2	107	287	55	156	2	199	917
12	**0**	**15**	**30**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**40**	**40**	**87**	**22**	**22**	**21**	**280**
Audrain	0	9	13	0	0	3	0	5	13	53	6	8	6	116
Montgomery	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	10	9	11	2	8	2	51
Warren	0	4	10	0	0	0	0	25	18	23	14	6	13	113

Appendix B: Law Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Juvenile Certified	Informal without Supervison	Informal with Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
13	**1**	**3**	**178**	**6**	**0**	**7**	**0**	**253**	**58**	**254**	**84**	**28**	**21**	**893**
Boone	1	3	132	6	0	6	0	236	40	167	51	13	10	665
Callaway	0	0	46	0	0	1	0	17	18	87	33	15	11	228
14	**0**	**11**	**19**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**11**	**37**	**32**	**19**	**4**	**14**	**150**
Howard	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	8	6	0	0	23
Randolph	0	11	17	0	0	3	0	7	34	24	13	4	14	127
15	**0**	**10**	**14**	**0**	**0**	**6**	**0**	**61**	**60**	**104**	**9**	**23**	**46**	**333**
Lafayette	0	3	5	0	0	6	0	15	16	101	0	23	29	198
Saline	0	7	9	0	0	0	0	46	44	3	9	0	17	135
16	**142**	**54**	**108**	**5**	**1**	**75**	**9**	**13**	**16**	**4**	**6**	**88**	**562**	**1,083**
Jackson	142	54	108	5	1	75	9	13	16	4	6	88	562	1,083
17	**1**	**19**	**118**	**3**	**8**	**31**	**1**	**205**	**147**	**103**	**13**	**1**	**21**	**671**
Cass	1	14	72	3	7	31	1	152	117	81	7	1	3	490
Johnson	0	5	46	0	1	0	0	53	30	22	6	0	18	181
18	**0**	**15**	**40**	**0**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**61**	**96**	**129**	**5**	**27**	**66**	**445**
Cooper	0	14	15	0	1	0	0	29	44	68	0	8	32	211
Pettis	0	1	25	0	1	2	2	32	52	61	5	19	34	234
19	**0**	**2**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**58**	**1**	**6**	**10**	**109**	**50**	**11**	**26**	**274**
Cole	0	2	1	0	0	58	1	6	10	109	50	11	26	274
20	**7**	**12**	**22**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**66**	**110**	**74**	**37**	**6**	**43**	**381**
Franklin	7	11	16	0	0	3	0	58	92	69	28	6	37	327
Gasconade	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	4	10	3	5	0	1	26
Osage	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	4	8	2	4	0	5	28
21	**116**	**23**	**75**	**54**	**80**	**9**	**30**	**315**	**236**	**756**	**449**	**13**	**970**	**3,126**
St. Louis Co.	116	23	75	54	80	9	30	315	236	756	449	13	970	3,126
22	**17**	**57**	**74**	**0**	**1**	**47**	**16**	**1**	**34**	**25**	**119**	**0**	**538**	**929**
St. Louis City	17	57	74	0	1	47	16	1	34	25	119	0	538	929
23	**26**	**28**	**69**	**0**	**0**	**46**	**0**	**218**	**115**	**344**	**32**	**3**	**61**	**942**
Jefferson	26	28	69	0	0	46	0	218	115	344	32	3	61	942
24	**7**	**25**	**39**	**0**	**2**	**18**	**3**	**133**	**21**	**85**	**17**	**14**	**43**	**407**
Madison	0	3	11	0	0	2	0	5	0	6	1	2	11	41
St. Francois	7	13	9	0	1	11	1	85	16	68	9	8	12	240
Ste. Genevieve	0	1	7	0	0	1	0	18	2	5	6	4	5	49
Washington	0	8	12	0	1	4	2	25	3	6	1	0	15	77
25	**0**	**5**	**16**	**0**	**0**	**6**	**2**	**150**	**44**	**0**	**11**	**59**	**14**	**307**
Maries	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Phelps	0	0	10	0	0	2	1	13	3	0	0	10	8	47
Pulaski	0	4	5	0	0	2	1	119	30	0	1	44	5	211
Texas	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	18	10	0	10	5	1	48

Appendix B: Law Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Juvenile Certified	Informal without Supervison	Informal with Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
26	**0**	**32**	**20**	**21**	**1**	**14**	**0**	**62**	**135**	**80**	**23**	**17**	**73**	**478**
Camden	0	3	4	5	1	0	0	12	37	17	8	9	11	107
Laclede	0	13	11	0	0	0	0	27	71	8	7	6	22	165
Miller	0	9	1	16	0	0	0	14	15	29	8	2	22	116
Moniteau	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4	4	8	0	0	5	24
Morgan	0	7	4	0	0	11	0	5	8	18	0	0	13	66
27	**0**	**2**	**11**	**0**	**2**	**1**	**0**	**22**	**72**	**22**	**23**	**12**	**13**	**180**
Bates	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4	3	3	2	30
Benton	0	1	9	0	2	0	0	1	20	1	0	0	2	36
Henry	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	13	25	15	15	7	5	84
St. Clair	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	2	5	2	4	30
28	**0**	**4**	**35**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**125**	**26**	**62**	**22**	**13**	**55**	**343**
Barton	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	18	9	4	0	0	0	32
Cedar	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	26	5	4	2	6	10	62
Dade	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	2	1	1	0	2	14
Vernon	0	4	25	0	0	1	0	73	10	53	19	7	43	235
29	**2**	**11**	**50**	**7**	**1**	**6**	**1**	**45**	**17**	**98**	**3**	**5**	**27**	**273**
Jasper	2	11	50	7	1	6	1	45	17	98	3	5	27	273
30	**0**	**26**	**16**	**12**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**68**	**93**	**47**	**39**	**105**	**410**
Dallas	0	3	7	1	0	0	0	1	11	23	3	10	12	71
Hickory	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	4	1	3	0	3	15
Polk	0	15	1	9	0	0	0	0	38	41	29	28	54	215
Webster	0	7	8	0	0	0	0	2	15	28	12	1	36	109
31	**1**	**54**	**39**	**0**	**1**	**13**	**6**	**26**	**41**	**77**	**19**	**9**	**3**	**289**
Greene	1	54	39	0	1	13	6	26	41	77	19	9	3	289
32	**0**	**18**	**39**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**36**	**179**	**70**	**8**	**14**	**54**	**418**
Bollinger	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	2	0	0	4	18
Cape Girardeau	0	18	37	0	0	0	0	36	114	65	8	14	37	329
Perry	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	3	0	0	13	71
33	**0**	**22**	**14**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**65**	**69**	**3**	**22**	**21**	**87**	**304**
Mississippi	0	8	4	0	0	0	0	14	13	1	2	4	11	57
Scott	0	14	10	0	0	0	1	51	56	2	20	17	76	247
34	**0**	**13**	**28**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**48**	**34**	**0**	**1**	**15**	**43**	**182**
New Madrid	0	3	14	0	0	0	0	17	9	0	1	4	7	55
Pemiscot	0	10	14	0	0	0	0	31	25	0	0	11	36	127
35	**21**	**7**	**26**	**0**	**0**	**38**	**1**	**27**	**67**	**69**	**10**	**9**	**4**	**279**
Dunklin	20	1	10	0	0	6	0	1	7	69	2	0	1	117
Stoddard	1	6	16	0	0	32	1	26	60	0	8	9	3	162
36	**0**	**13**	**55**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**35**	**26**	**132**	**17**	**31**	**85**	**394**
Carter	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	1	2	6	21
Butler	0	12	47	0	0	0	0	32	21	116	16	29	77	350
Ripley	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	0	0	2	23

Appendix B: Law Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Juvenile Certified	Informal without Supervison	Informal with Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
37	**0**	**5**	**24**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**27**	**33**	**24**	**5**	**24**	**35**	**181**
Howell	0	5	13	0	0	4	0	26	21	19	4	17	24	133
Oregon	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	1	6	11	39
Shannon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	1	0	9
38	**0**	**19**	**29**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**121**	**78**	**31**	**48**	**17**	**33**	**376**
Christian	0	19	29	0	0	0	0	121	78	31	48	17	33	376
39	**0**	**8**	**8**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**111**	**29**	**140**	**13**	**3**	**44**	**356**
Barry	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	18	12	40	1	0	24	103
Lawrence	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	59	10	44	7	3	18	146
Stone	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	34	7	56	5	0	2	107
40	**2**	**13**	**37**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**1**	**47**	**85**	**70**	**14**	**64**	**94**	**429**
McDonald	1	7	24	0	0	2	1	26	51	7	0	15	16	150
Newton	1	6	13	0	0	0	0	21	34	63	14	49	78	279
41	**1**	**1**	**3**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**8**	**25**	**2**	**1**	**0**	**3**	**45**
Macon	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	6	6	1	0	0	2	19
Shelby	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	1	1	0	1	26
42	**0**	**7**	**8**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**56**	**25**	**3**	**6**	**9**	**114**
Crawford	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	2	2	2	9	24
Dent	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	30	4	0	0	0	44
Iron	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Reynolds	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	0	0	8
Wayne	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	15	0	4	0	35
43	**3**	**10**	**14**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**8**	**45**	**20**	**24**	**11**	**37**	**175**
Caldwell	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	1	1	5	24
Clinton	1	4	4	1	0	0	1	2	9	5	5	3	8	43
Daviess	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	7	3	1	22
DeKalb	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	1	3	7	18
Livingston	0	3	7	0	0	1	0	3	22	5	10	1	16	68
44	**0**	**1**	**5**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**47**	**2**	**0**	**25**	**9**	**92**
Douglas	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	5	2	15
Ozark	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	3	1	9
Wright	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	2	36	2	0	17	6	68
45	**1**	**1**	**15**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**31**	**34**	**55**	**17**	**2**	**41**	**199**
Lincoln	1	1	13	0	0	1	0	27	31	36	14	0	24	148
Pike	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	4	3	19	3	2	17	51
46	**0**	**13**	**13**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**79**	**49**	**60**	**16**	**15**	**20**	**266**
Taney	0	13	13	0	0	1	0	79	49	60	16	15	20	266
Statewide Total	**401**	**648**	**1,470**	**113**	**104**	**424**	**90**	**2,912**	**2,969**	**3,399**	**1,452**	**694**	**3,673**	**18,349**

Appendix C: Status Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Informal without Supervision	Informal with Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
1	**0**	**4**	**9**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**10**	**23**	**73**	**2**	**7**	**19**	**148**
Clark	0	2	6	0	0	1	5	10	40	1	5	12	82
Schuyler	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	14	1	0	0	20
Scotland	0	2	1	0	0	0	4	11	19	0	2	7	46
2	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**74**	**24**	**4**	**28**	**6**	**139**
Adair	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	40	9	3	19	2	75
Knox	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	0	2	0	17
Lewis	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	19	15	1	7	4	47
3	**0**	**1**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**21**	**39**	**30**	**1**	**11**	**19**	**125**
Grundy	0	1	2	0	0	0	16	21	22	0	10	12	84
Harrison	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	2	0	0	0	9
Mercer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	1	5
Putnam	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4	1	0	6	27
4	**0**	**0**	**6**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**87**	**85**	**3**	**2**	**22**	**48**	**253**
Atchison	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	6	0	0	4	6	30
Gentry	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	17	0	0	0	3	25
Holt	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	14	0	0	1	16	40
Nodaway	0	0	6	0	0	0	59	46	3	2	17	22	155
Worth	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	3
5	**2**	**18**	**11**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**143**	**175**	**18**	**1**	**37**	**5**	**411**
Andrew	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	29	0	0	3	3	42
Buchanan	2	18	11	0	1	0	136	146	18	1	34	2	369
6	**0**	**5**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**9**	**19**	**17**	**4**	**0**	**9**	**64**
Platte	0	5	1	0	0	0	9	19	17	4	0	9	64
7	**0**	**9**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**7**	**17**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**36**
Clay	0	9	2	0	0	1	7	17	0	0	0	0	36
8	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**48**	**31**	**29**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**111**
Carroll	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	2	3	0	0	0	11
Ray	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	29	26	2	0	0	100
9	**0**	**1**	**5**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**19**	**11**	**43**	**2**	**14**	**45**	**142**
Chariton	0	1	5	1	0	0	3	2	7	0	6	17	42
Linn	0	0	0	1	0	0	8	4	16	2	7	22	60
Sullivan	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	20	0	1	6	40
10	**52**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**31**	**17**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**18**	**119**
Marion	52	0	0	0	0	0	24	7	0	0	1	15	99
Monroe	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Ralls	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	0	0	0	3	18
11	**2**	**3**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**37**	**54**	**78**	**42**	**0**	**42**	**262**
St. Charles	2	3	4	0	0	0	37	54	78	42	0	42	262
12	**0**	**6**	**6**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**35**	**77**	**122**	**12**	**15**	**9**	**286**
Audrain	0	2	0	0	0	4	6	45	72	8	8	6	151
Montgomery	0	4	5	0	0	0	18	17	23	2	3	2	74
Warren	0	0	1	0	0	0	11	15	27	2	4	1	61

Appendix C: Status Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Informal without Supervision	Informal with Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
13	**0**	**6**	**85**	**10**	**0**	**11**	**272**	**86**	**506**	**38**	**14**	**31**	**1,059**
Boone	0	6	35	10	0	11	249	49	326	27	7	29	749
Callaway	0	0	50	0	0	0	23	37	180	11	7	2	310
14	**0**	**26**	**29**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**26**	**48**	**147**	**9**	**146**	**26**	**460**
Howard	0	1	1	0	0	0	11	9	20	3	24	2	71
Randolph	0	25	28	0	0	3	15	39	127	6	122	24	389
15	**0**	**8**	**7**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**63**	**19**	**122**	**1**	**13**	**28**	**261**
Lafayette	0	2	7	0	0	0	10	3	99	0	13	12	146
Saline	0	6	0	0	0	0	53	16	23	1	0	16	115
16	**8**	**2**	**6**	**0**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**5**	**58**	**85**
Jackson	8	2	6	0	0	5	0	0	0	1	5	58	85
17	**0**	**9**	**40**	**4**	**1**	**6**	**241**	**115**	**155**	**11**	**0**	**44**	**626**
Cass	0	4	28	2	1	6	130	70	110	3	0	24	378
Johnson	0	5	12	2	0	0	111	45	45	8	0	20	248
18	**0**	**4**	**5**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**43**	**53**	**119**	**7**	**16**	**13**	**262**
Cooper	0	1	5	0	0	0	16	28	75	1	9	7	142
Pettis	0	3	0	2	0	0	27	25	44	6	7	6	120
19	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**13**	**4**	**8**	**76**	**15**	**13**	**27**	**159**
Cole	0	2	0	0	1	13	4	8	76	15	13	27	159
20	**3**	**1**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**7**	**20**	**18**	**28**	**5**	**4**	**6**	**95**
Franklin	3	1	3	0	0	7	18	13	28	3	4	6	86
Gasconade	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	1	0	0	6
Osage	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	3
21	**6**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**12**	**0**	**52**	**34**	**392**	**131**	**12**	**414**	**1,054**
St. Louis Co.	6	0	0	1	12	0	52	34	392	131	12	414	1,054
22	**3**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**29**	**25**	**6**	**0**	**86**	**153**
St. Louis City	3	1	0	0	0	3	0	29	25	6	0	86	153
23	**10**	**15**	**43**	**0**	**0**	**39**	**69**	**64**	**237**	**17**	**14**	**57**	**565**
Jefferson	10	15	43	0	0	39	69	64	237	17	14	57	565
24	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**52**	**3**	**133**	**8**	**7**	**9**	**215**
Madison	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	9
St. Francois	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	2	57	3	3	2	94
Ste. Genevieve	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	1	41	4	0	0	56
Washington	0	2	0	0	0	1	15	0	26	1	4	7	56
25	**0**	**4**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**437**	**48**	**0**	**8**	**155**	**72**	**729**
Maries	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	7	13
Phelps	0	1	2	0	0	0	107	12	0	0	40	50	212
Pulaski	0	2	1	0	0	1	213	31	0	1	64	15	328
Texas	0	1	1	0	0	0	111	5	0	7	51	0	176

Appendix C: Status Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Informal without Supervision	Informal with Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
26	**0**	**4**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**57**	**61**	**102**	**4**	**41**	**36**	**308**
Camden	0	1	1	0	0	0	8	9	20	0	32	1	72
Laclede	0	1	0	0	0	0	38	34	33	1	6	15	128
Miller	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	6	16	1	2	10	42
Moniteau	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	2	1	4	27
Morgan	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	17	0	0	6	39
27	**0**	**1**	**3**	**1**	**0**	**2**	**76**	**104**	**57**	**7**	**9**	**17**	**277**
Bates	0	1	0	0	0	1	21	29	13	1	0	3	69
Benton	0	0	3	0	0	0	21	20	7	0	2	1	54
Henry	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	31	21	4	5	2	86
St. Clair	0	0	0	1	0	0	12	24	16	2	2	11	68
28	**0**	**2**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**183**	**32**	**49**	**4**	**12**	**13**	**298**
Barton	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	6	1	0	0	0	33
Cedar	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	9	7	1	4	0	60
Dade	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	1	1	0	0	0	24
Vernon	0	2	3	0	0	0	96	16	40	3	8	13	181
29	**0**	**3**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**10**	**1**	**47**	**0**	**6**	**9**	**79**
Jasper	0	3	3	0	0	0	10	1	47	0	6	9	79
30	**0**	**3**	**10**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**2**	**56**	**27**	**47**	**21**	**167**
Dallas	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	3	21	7	48
Hickory	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	2	2	16
Polk	0	0	9	0	0	0	1	0	13	19	13	8	63
Webster	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	22	0	11	4	40
31	**0**	**1**	**6**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**9**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**19**
Greene	0	1	6	0	0	0	1	1	9	0	0	1	19
32	**1**	**2**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**140**	**167**	**425**	**2**	**10**	**23**	**772**
Bollinger	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	40	69	0	3	13	126
Cape Girardeau	1	2	2	0	0	0	138	58	299	0	7	3	510
Perry	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	69	57	2	0	7	136
33	**0**	**4**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**23**	**30**	**3**	**10**	**14**	**17**	**104**
Mississippi	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	3	3	15
Scott	0	3	1	0	0	0	22	25	3	10	11	14	89
34	**0**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**120**	**72**	**7**	**0**	**23**	**32**	**256**
New Madrid	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	36	2	0	7	12	98
Pemiscot	0	1	1	0	0	0	79	36	5	0	16	20	158
35	**12**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**56**	**99**	**177**	**2**	**7**	**3**	**361**
Dunklin	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	177	0	0	0	201
Stoddard	1	1	0	0	0	3	56	87	0	2	7	3	160
36	**0**	**3**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7**	**7**	**95**	**12**	**8**	**0**	**135**
Carter	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3
Butler	0	2	3	0	0	0	2	6	91	12	8	0	124
Ripley	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	1	1	0	0	0	8

Appendix C: Status Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Informal without Supervision	Informal with Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
37	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**75**	**14**	**21**	**4**	**26**	**26**	**167**
Howell	0	0	0	0	0	1	66	11	14	4	13	15	124
Oregon	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	10	5	20
Shannon	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	2	5	0	3	6	23
38	**0**	**27**	**11**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**165**	**63**	**67**	**72**	**38**	**50**	**494**
Christian	0	27	11	0	0	1	165	63	67	72	38	50	494
39	**0**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**63**	**27**	**127**	**4**	**5**	**21**	**251**
Barry	0	0	3	0	0	0	6	13	25	1	0	6	54
Lawrence	0	0	1	0	0	0	34	11	61	2	2	14	125
Stone	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	3	41	1	3	1	72
40	**2**	**7**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**28**	**64**	**40**	**8**	**70**	**14**	**236**
McDonald	0	2	3	0	0	0	19	36	7	0	11	0	78
Newton	2	5	0	0	0	0	9	28	33	8	59	14	158
41	**0**	**0**	**3**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**37**	**38**	**14**	**1**	**2**	**12**	**109**
Macon	0	0	2	2	0	0	27	18	8	1	1	11	70
Shelby	0	0	1	0	0	0	10	20	6	0	1	1	39
42	**8**	**12**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**47**	**60**	**0**	**24**	**1**	**152**
Crawford	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	5
Dent	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	34	40	0	0	0	82
Iron	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	2	0	19	0	31
Reynolds	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	0	2	0	12
Wayne	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	0	3	1	22
43	**6**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**7**	**10**	**29**	**8**	**22**	**22**	**106**
Caldwell	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	1	5	1	16
Clinton	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	0	6	1	26
Daviess	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	2	2	11
DeKalb	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	7
Livingston	0	0	1	1	0	0	4	7	8	3	6	16	46
44	**0**	**2**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**12**	**2**	**0**	**7**	**4**	**32**
Douglas	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	2	0	7
Ozark	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	1	0	0	0	7
Wright	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	0	5	4	18
45	**0**	**2**	**6**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**20**	**27**	**156**	**4**	**9**	**58**	**282**
Lincoln	0	2	6	0	0	0	20	26	135	3	9	51	252
Pike	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	1	0	7	30
46	**0**	**2**	**3**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**40**	**14**	**22**	**2**	**19**	**9**	**112**
Taney	0	2	3	1	0	0	40	14	22	2	19	9	112
Statewide Total	**115**	**204**	**340**	**25**	**15**	**105**	**2,838**	**2,039**	**3,942**	**500**	**933**	**1,480**	**12,536**

Appendix D: CA/N Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Informal without Supervision	Informal with Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
1	**0**	**18**	**6**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**3**	**5**	**0**	**28**	**19**	**81**
Clark	0	13	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	0	7	15	41
Schuyler	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	5	2	13
Scotland	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	16	2	27
2	**0**	**66**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**12**	**6**	**86**
Adair	0	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	51
Knox	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	12
Lewis	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	23
3	**0**	**30**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**42**	**14**	**3**	**86**	**71**	**248**
Grundy	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	29	3	0	43	29	116
Harrison	0	11	0	0	0	0	1	10	2	3	23	24	74
Mercer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	3	9
Putnam	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	0	16	15	49
4	**0**	**47**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**53**	**7**	**2**	**8**	**17**	**40**	**177**
Atchison	0	10	0	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	2	3	20
Gentry	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	8
Holt	0	5	0	1	1	0	12	1	0	2	6	8	36
Nodaway	0	28	0	0	0	0	37	4	1	6	8	27	111
Worth	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
5	**0**	**28**	**11**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**48**	**4**	**91**
Andrew	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	8
Buchanan	0	22	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	4	83
6	**0**	**11**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7**	**19**
Platte	0	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	19
7	**1**	**95**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**8**	**0**	**2**	**2**	**3**	**0**	**196**	**309**
Clay	1	95	2	0	0	8	0	2	2	3	0	196	309
8	**0**	**7**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**10**	**4**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**26**
Carroll	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
Ray	0	6	3	0	0	0	9	3	2	0	0	0	23
9	**1**	**26**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**11**	**1**	**9**	**5**	**55**
Chariton	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	11
Linn	1	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	2	25
Sullivan	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	1	4	2	19
10	**6**	**22**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**31**
Marion	6	14	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Monroe	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Ralls	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
11	**72**	**115**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**191**
St. Charles	72	115	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	191
12	**0**	**67**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**8**	**9**	**28**	**23**	**4**	**98**	**3**	**241**
Audrain	0	23	0	0	1	8	4	8	12	1	2	1	60
Montgomery	0	12	0	0	0	0	5	17	0	1	56	0	91
Warren	0	32	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	2	40	2	90

Appendix D: CA/N Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Informal without Supervision	Informal with Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
13	**0**	**191**	**14**	**17**	**0**	**3**	**12**	**0**	**13**	**3**	**0**	**3**	**256**
Boone	0	130	2	17	0	2	2	0	3	2	0	2	160
Callaway	0	61	12	0	0	1	10	0	10	1	0	1	96
14	**0**	**100**	**4**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**116**	**9**	**22**	**12**	**266**
Howard	0	31	4	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	6	2	60
Randolph	0	69	0	0	1	1	0	1	99	9	16	10	206
15	**0**	**18**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**25**
Lafayette	0	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	11
Saline	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	14
16	**319**	**246**	**29**	**0**	**9**	**17**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**9**	**17**	**267**	**913**
Jackson	319	246	29	0	9	17	0	0	0	9	17	267	913
17	**10**	**164**	**24**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**13**	**6**	**182**	**1**	**0**	**12**	**413**
Cass	10	93	12	0	0	0	7	6	181	1	0	12	322
Johnson	0	71	12	1	0	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	91
18	**1**	**27**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6**	**30**	**20**	**2**	**6**	**6**	**99**
Cooper	1	17	0	0	0	0	6	15	14	0	4	5	62
Pettis	0	10	1	0	0	0	0	15	6	2	2	1	37
19	**0**	**54**	**11**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**1**	**13**	**2**	**84**
Cole	0	54	11	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	13	2	84
20	**0**	**118**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**123**
Franklin	0	84	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
Gasconade	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Osage	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
21	**104**	**247**	**20**	**35**	**33**	**11**	**13**	**6**	**26**	**13**	**0**	**148**	**656**
St. Louis Co.	104	247	20	35	33	11	13	6	26	13		148	656
22	**45**	**220**	**2**	**1**	**0**	**10**	**0**	**0**	**31**	**1**	**0**	**15**	**325**
St. Louis City	45	220	2	1	0	10	0	0	31	1	0	15	325
23	**14**	**165**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**17**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**12**	**35**	**250**
Jefferson	14	165	4	0	0	17	0	0	0	3	12	35	250
24	**5**	**133**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6**	**1**	**22**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**168**
Madison	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
St. Francois	5	66	0	0	0	0	0	22	0	0	0	1	94
Ste. Genevieve	0	26	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Washington	0	29	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	34
25	**4**	**216**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**6**	**249**	**30**	**0**	**5**	**313**	**49**	**874**
Maries	0	7	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	4	0	13
Phelps	4	91	0	0	1	4	27	5	0	0	40	27	199
Pulaski	0	95	0	0	0	0	203	22	0	2	124	22	468
Texas	0	23	1	0	0	1	18	3	0	3	145	0	194
26	**0**	**102**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**5**	**2**	**249**	**1**	**36**	**50**	**445**
Camden	0	11	0	0	0	0	4	0	38	1	21	6	81
Laclede	0	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	116	0	1	43	194
Miller	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	52	0	14	0	91
Moniteau	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	11
Morgan	0	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	37	0	0	1	68

Appendix D: CA/N Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Informal without Supervision	Informal with Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
27	**0**	**75**	**13**	**0**	**0**	**9**	**74**	**64**	**95**	**4**	**16**	**1**	**351**
Bates	0	17	3	0	0	0	42	15	21	2	5	1	106
Benton	0	36	5	0	0	0	19	11	3	0	6	0	80
Henry	0	19	1	0	0	9	9	32	52	2	4	0	128
St. Clair	0	3	4	0	0	0	4	6	19	0	1	0	37
28	**0**	**12**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**90**	**4**	**33**	**6**	**9**	**7**	**163**
Barton	0	4	1	0	0	0	19	4	2	0	5	1	36
Cedar	0	1	0	0	0	0	10	0	16	6	0	0	33
Dade	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	0	1	0	10
Vernon	0	7	0	0	0	1	60	0	7	0	3	6	84
29	**0**	**134**	**28**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**9**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**3**	**178**
Jasper	0	134	28	0	0	0	9	0	2	0	2	3	178
30	**0**	**61**	**7**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**27**	**6**	**170**	**36**	**307**
Dallas	0	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	32	11	55
Hickory	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	9
Polk	0	13	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5	10	11	53
Webster	0	34	5	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	127	12	190
31	**0**	**291**	**15**	**0**	**1**	**76**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**4**	**39**	**428**
Greene	0	291	15		1	76				2	4	39	428
32	**0**	**60**	**31**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**151**	**34**	**2**	**43**	**11**	**334**
Bollinger	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	16
Cape Girardeau	0	60	21	0	0	0	1	130	1	0	21	7	241
Perry	0	0	9	0	0	0	1	21	33	2	7	4	77
33	**0**	**60**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**70**
Mississippi	0	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Scott	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	3	0	28
34	**0**	**70**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**43**	**10**	**129**
New Madrid	0	28	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	16	2	48
Pemiscot	0	42	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	27	8	81
35	**20**	**103**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**33**	**10**	**35**	**6**	**83**	**3**	**297**
Dunklin	20	24	0	0	0	1	1	0	35	4	0	1	86
Stoddard	0	79	0	0	0	3	32	10	0	2	83	2	211
36	**0**	**110**	**24**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**5**	**41**	**9**	**1**	**7**	**1**	**200**
Carter	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	8
Butler	0	83	24	0	0	1	5	41	8	1	0	0	163
Ripley	0	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	29
37	**0**	**46**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**9**	**0**	**10**	**0**	**11**	**10**	**89**
Howell	0	26	0	0	0	2	9	0	9	0	8	4	58
Oregon	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	15
Shannon	0	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	16

Appendix D: CA/N Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Informal without Supervision	Informal with Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
38	**0**	**73**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**16**	**12**	**14**	**85**	**52**	**256**
Christian	0	73	3	0	0	0	1	16	12	14	85	52	256
39	**0**	**68**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**174**	**2**	**20**	**1**	**8**	**5**	**280**
Barry	0	22	1	0	1	0	146	2	5	0	0	3	180
Lawrence	0	27	0	0	0	0	23	0	2	1	1	1	55
Stone	0	19	0	0	0	0	5	0	13	0	7	1	45
40	**3**	**133**	**2**	**0**	**4**	**35**	**12**	**0**	**5**	**1**	**71**	**28**	**294**
McDonald	1	57	0	0	3	8	12	0	4	0	21	6	112
Newton	2	76	2	0	1	27	0	0	1	1	50	22	182
41	**0**	**29**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**5**	**18**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**57**
Macon	0	26	0	0	0	0	1	11	2	0	0	0	40
Shelby	0	3	1	0	0	0	4	7	0	0	0	2	17
42	**0**	**138**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**10**	**0**	**4**	**2**	**156**
Crawford	0	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Dent	0	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Iron	0	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Reynolds	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	1	1	31
Wayne	0	22	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	29
43	**1**	**63**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**29**	**60**	**154**
Caldwell	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11		22
Clinton	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	15
Daviess	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	11
DeKalb	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	10
Livingston	0	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	52	96
44	**0**	**61**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**5**	**1**	**68**
Douglas	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	15
Ozark	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Wright	0	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	49
45	**3**	**24**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**2**	**1**	**6**	**1**	**0**	**98**	**91**	**227**
Lincoln	3	21	0	1		2	1	6	1	0	98	90	223
Pike	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4
46	**7**	**121**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**14**	**3**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**153**
Taney	7	121	0	0	0	5	0	14	3	0	3	0	153
Statewide Total	**616**	**4,265**	**267**	**57**	**53**	**233**	**793**	**520**	**1,000**	**113**	**1,412**	**1,314**	**10,643**

Appendix E: Administrative Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Juvenile Certified	Informal without Supervision	Informal with Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
3	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Harrison	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
4	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**
Nodaway	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	4
5	**1**	**5**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**2**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**12**
Andrew	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Buchanan	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	10
6	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
Platte	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
7	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Clay	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
11	**2**	**5**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**14**
St. Charles	2	5	4	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	14
14	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**
Howard	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Randolph	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
15	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Lafayette	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
16	**28**	**36**	**17**	**1**	**1**	**34**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**53**	**176**
Jackson	28	36	17	1	1	34	2	0	0	0	0	4	53	176
18	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
Cooper	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Pettis	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
19	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**7**
Cole	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	1	1	7
21	**38**	**4**	**10**	**28**	**66**	**11**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**8**	**166**
St. Louis Co.	38	4	10	28	66	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	8	166
22	**7**	**14**	**11**	**0**	**0**	**24**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**59**
St. Louis City	7	14	11	0	0	24	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	59
25	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Pulaski	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
26	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**5**
Camden	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Morgan	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	4
28	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**3**
Vernon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	3
29	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Jasper	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

Appendix E: Administrative Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Juvenile Certified	Informal without Supervision	Informal with Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
30	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**16**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**16**
Hickory	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Dallas	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Polk	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	14
33	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
Mississippi	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Scott	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
34	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Pemiscot	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
35	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Dunklin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Stoddard	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
37	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**1**	**37**	**0**	**11**	**0**	**51**
Howell	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	30	0	4	0	35
Oregon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	0	3	0	11
Shannon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	5
39	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
Barry	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
40	**0**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**19**	**54**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**78**
McDonald	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	19	54	2	0	0	1	78
43	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
Livingston	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
45	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
Lincoln	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Statewide Total	**77**	**73**	**49**	**30**	**67**	**74**	**3**	**26**	**62**	**67**	**1**	**19**	**64**	**612**

Appendix F: Type of Referrals by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Miscellaneous	People	Property	Peace Disturbance	Substance	Status	CA/N	Total
1	**2**	**19**	**7**	**8**	**6**	**148**	**81**	**271**
Clark	1	14	4	2	5	82	41	149
Schuyler	1	4	2	5	1	20	13	46
Scotland	0	1	1	1	0	46	27	76
2	**7**	**20**	**15**	**11**	**12**	**139**	**86**	**290**
Adair	6	19	10	6	0	75	51	167
Knox	0	0	0	0	0	17	12	29
Lewis	1	1	5	5	12	47	23	94
3	**19**	**45**	**12**	**2**	**6**	**125**	**248**	**457**
Grundy	0	30	6	1	5	84	116	242
Harrison	4	7	2	0	0	9	74	96
Mercer	1	2	0	1	0	5	9	18
Putnam	14	6	4	0	1	27	49	101
4	**16**	**19**	**23**	**4**	**27**	**253**	**177**	**519**
Atchison	0	0	2	0	1	30	20	53
Gentry	0	1	2	2	2	25	8	40
Holt	0	3	0	0	1	40	36	80
Nodaway	16	15	18	2	23	155	111	340
Worth	0	0	1	0	0	3	2	6
5	**78**	**111**	**44**	**12**	**9**	**412**	**91**	**757**
Andrew	8	8	3	0	0	42	8	69
Buchanan	70	103	41	12	9	370	83	688
6	**68**	**64**	**57**	**34**	**69**	**64**	**19**	**375**
Platte	68	64	57	34	69	64	19	375
7	**35**	**179**	**105**	**35**	**53**	**40**	**309**	**756**
Clay	35	179	105	35	53	40	309	756
8	**9**	**34**	**14**	**0**	**6**	**111**	**26**	**200**
Carroll	0	8	4	0	2	11	3	28
Ray	9	26	10	0	4	100	23	172
9	**1**	**13**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**142**	**55**	**215**
Chariton	0	1	1	0	0	42	11	55
Linn	1	11	2	0	0	60	25	99
Sullivan	0	1	1	0	0	40	19	61
10	**13**	**28**	**26**	**49**	**13**	**119**	**31**	**279**
Marion	10	22	19	46	12	99	23	231
Monroe	0	1	3	0	0	2	6	12
Ralls	3	5	4	3	1	18	2	36
11	**90**	**377**	**299**	**62**	**99**	**266**	**191**	**1,384**
St. Charles	90	377	299	62	99	266	191	1,384
12	**57**	**136**	**49**	**11**	**27**	**286**	**241**	**807**
Audrain	30	49	19	2	16	151	60	327
Montgomery	6	28	5	7	5	74	91	216
Warren	21	59	25	2	6	61	90	264

Appendix F: Type of Referrals by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Miscellaneous	People	Property	Peace Disturbance	Substance	Status	CA/N	Total
13	**119**	**392**	**230**	**116**	**36**	**1,059**	**256**	**2,208**
Boone	87	313	174	85	6	749	160	1,574
Callaway	32	79	56	31	30	310	96	634
14	**30**	**33**	**25**	**52**	**13**	**460**	**266**	**879**
Howard	4	5	7	5	4	71	60	156
Randolph	26	28	18	47	9	389	206	723
15	**68**	**147**	**78**	**20**	**20**	**262**	**25**	**620**
Lafayette	22	89	52	20	16	146	11	356
Saline	46	58	26	0	4	116	14	264
16	**298**	**376**	**435**	**87**	**63**	**86**	**913**	**2,258**
Jackson	298	376	435	87	63	86	913	2,258
17	**66**	**270**	**164**	**89**	**82**	**626**	**414**	**1,711**
Cass	51	178	122	74	65	378	323	1,191
Johnson	15	92	42	15	17	248	91	520
18	**48**	**151**	**122**	**75**	**51**	**262**	**99**	**808**
Cooper	16	70	48	59	19	142	62	416
Pettis	32	81	74	16	32	120	37	392
19	**58**	**90**	**80**	**15**	**38**	**159**	**84**	**524**
Cole	58	90	80	15	38	159	84	524
20	**26**	**139**	**89**	**30**	**97**	**95**	**123**	**599**
Franklin	16	119	79	25	88	86	89	502
Gasconade	6	9	4	3	4	6	17	49
Osage	4	11	6	2	5	3	17	48
21	**601**	**1,121**	**1,270**	**188**	**112**	**1,054**	**656**	**5,002**
St. Louis Co.	601	1,121	1,270	188	112	1,054	656	5,002
22	**220**	**294**	**437**	**20**	**17**	**153**	**325**	**1,466**
St. Louis City	220	294	437	20	17	153	325	1,466
23	**145**	**489**	**196**	**70**	**42**	**565**	**250**	**1,757**
Jefferson	145	489	196	70	42	565	250	1,757
24	**39**	**192**	**100**	**54**	**22**	**215**	**168**	**790**
Madison	6	10	21	3	1	9	12	62
St. Francois	22	122	52	35	9	94	94	428
Ste. Genevieve	5	28	5	6	5	56	28	133
Washington	6	32	22	10	7	56	34	167
25	**41**	**115**	**83**	**19**	**50**	**729**	**874**	**1,911**
Maries	0	1	0	0	0	13	13	27
Phelps	2	15	18	1	11	212	199	458
Pulaski	35	88	39	16	34	328	468	1,008
Texas	4	11	26	2	5	176	194	418
26	**75**	**144**	**109**	**42**	**113**	**308**	**445**	**1,236**
Camden	11	26	25	6	40	72	81	261
Laclede	9	57	42	21	36	128	194	487
Miller	34	33	27	8	14	42	91	249
Moniteau	5	8	2	2	7	27	11	62
Morgan	16	20	13	5	16	39	68	177

Appendix F: Type of Referrals by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Miscellaneous	People	Property	Peace Disturbance	Substance	Status	CA/N	Total
27	**27**	**72**	**48**	**12**	**21**	**277**	**351**	**808**
Bates	1	15	7	2	5	69	106	205
Benton	6	9	14	2	5	54	80	170
Henry	18	32	22	5	7	86	128	298
St. Clair	2	16	5	3	4	68	37	135
28	**52**	**149**	**83**	**24**	**38**	**298**	**169**	**813**
Barton	3	12	12	3	2	33	36	101
Cedar	11	23	15	5	8	60	39	161
Dade	0	4	5	3	2	24	10	48
Vernon	38	110	51	13	26	181	84	503
29	**35**	**124**	**76**	**28**	**11**	**79**	**178**	**531**
Jasper	35	124	76	28	11	79	178	531
30	**94**	**180**	**94**	**39**	**19**	**167**	**307**	**900**
Dallas	12	28	16	9	7	48	55	175
Hickory	6	7	1	2	0	16	9	41
Polk	61	99	50	13	6	63	53	345
Webster	15	46	27	15	6	40	190	339
31	**30**	**147**	**84**	**10**	**18**	**19**	**428**	**736**
Greene	30	147	84	10	18	19	428	736
32	**111**	**147**	**92**	**19**	**43**	**778**	**334**	**1,524**
Bollinger	8	5	5	0	0	126	16	160
Cape Girardeau	69	128	83	15	33	511	241	1,080
Perry	34	14	4	4	10	141	77	284
33	**63**	**113**	**62**	**42**	**25**	**106**	**70**	**481**
Mississippi	14	23	11	6	4	15	42	115
Scott	49	90	51	36	21	91	28	366
34	**25**	**50**	**43**	**40**	**25**	**256**	**129**	**568**
New Madrid	2	25	20	5	3	98	48	201
Pemiscot	23	25	23	35	22	158	81	367
35	**41**	**77**	**51**	**97**	**13**	**361**	**297**	**937**
Dunklin	17	41	28	29	2	201	86	404
Stoddard	24	36	23	68	11	160	211	533
36	**59**	**172**	**82**	**33**	**48**	**135**	**200**	**729**
Carter	5	7	4	2	3	3	8	32
Butler	50	153	75	27	45	124	163	637
Ripley	4	12	3	4	0	8	29	60
37	**100**	**68**	**43**	**12**	**9**	**167**	**89**	**488**
Howell	72	50	31	8	7	124	58	350
Oregon	22	15	7	4	2	20	15	85
Shannon	6	3	5	0	0	23	16	53

Appendix F: Type of Referrals by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Miscellaneous	People	Property	Peace Disturbance	Substance	Status	CA/N	Total
38	**53**	**132**	**93**	**29**	**69**	**494**	**256**	**1,126**
Christian	53	132	93	29	69	494	256	1,126
39	**86**	**136**	**54**	**17**	**65**	**251**	**280**	**889**
Barry	32	34	17	3	19	54	180	339
Lawrence	25	69	18	9	25	125	55	326
Stone	29	33	19	5	21	72	45	224
40	**132**	**136**	**94**	**56**	**89**	**236**	**294**	**1,037**
McDonald	96	47	25	19	41	78	112	418
Newton	36	89	69	37	48	158	182	619
41	**19**	**16**	**7**	**2**	**1**	**109**	**57**	**211**
Macon	11	3	4	0	1	70	40	129
Shelby	8	13	3	2	0	39	17	82
42	**31**	**18**	**25**	**21**	**18**	**153**	**156**	**422**
Crawford	6	6	6	0	6	5	29	58
Dent	13	7	15	4	4	83	38	164
Iron	0	1	2	0	0	31	29	63
Reynolds	3	0	1	3	1	12	31	51
Wayne	9	4	1	14	7	22	29	86
43	**32**	**63**	**31**	**15**	**36**	**106**	**154**	**437**
Caldwell	1	11	1	5	6	16	22	62
Clinton	6	13	12	1	11	26	15	84
Daviess	4	12	3	0	3	11	11	44
DeKalb	5	8	1	2	2	7	10	35
Livingston	16	19	14	7	14	46	96	212
44	**19**	**28**	**28**	**3**	**14**	**32**	**68**	**192**
Douglas	2	5	5	0	3	7	15	37
Ozark	1	3	3	0	2	7	4	20
Wright	16	20	20	3	9	18	49	135
45	**25**	**66**	**43**	**30**	**37**	**282**	**227**	**710**
Lincoln	15	47	31	26	31	252	223	625
Pike	10	19	12	4	6	30	4	85
46	**25**	**99**	**71**	**25**	**46**	**112**	**153**	**531**
Taney	25	99	71	25	46	112	153	531
Statewide Total	**3,288**	**6,991**	**5,277**	**1,659**	**1,728**	**12,556**	**10,650**	**42,149**

Appendix G: Law Referrals by Level, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Felony A	Felony B	Felony C	Felony D	Felony E	Felony U	Infraction	Juvenile	Misdemeanor A	Misdemeanor B	Misdemeanor C	Misdemeanor D	Misdemeanor U	Ordinance	Total
1	**1**	**1**	**0**	**3**	**11**	**1**	**2**	**0**	**5**	**4**	**5**	**9**	**0**	**0**	**42**
Clark	1	0	0	1	3	1	2	0	5	1	4	8	0	0	26
Schuyler	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	13
Scotland	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
2	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**19**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**21**	**9**	**0**	**11**	**0**	**1**	**65**
Adair	0	0	0	3	14	0	0	0	20	3	0	0	0	1	41
Knox	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lewis	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	1	6	0	11	0	0	24
3	**2**	**5**	**2**	**20**	**14**	**3**	**3**	**0**	**13**	**10**	**3**	**8**	**0**	**0**	**83**
Grundy	0	1	2	5	11	3	1	0	7	3	3	6	0	0	42
Harrison	0	2	0	3	1	0	2	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	12
Mercer	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	4
Putnam	0	2	0	12	2	0	0	0	3	4	0	2	0	0	25
4	**0**	**2**	**0**	**10**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**25**	**11**	**6**	**29**	**0**	**0**	**85**
Atchison	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3
Gentry	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3	0	0	7
Holt	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4
Nodaway	0	2	0	6	1	1	0	0	23	10	5	22	0	0	70
Worth	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
5	**3**	**4**	**0**	**23**	**18**	**4**	**5**	**1**	**103**	**21**	**16**	**11**	**1**	**33**	**243**
Andrew	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	7	1	1	0	0	5	17
Buchanan	3	4	0	21	18	3	5	1	96	20	15	11	1	28	226
6	**2**	**2**	**1**	**15**	**12**	**2**	**49**	**0**	**51**	**39**	**35**	**82**	**0**	**0**	**290**
Platte	2	2	1	15	12	2	49	0	51	39	35	82	0	0	290
7	**2**	**4**	**1**	**36**	**35**	**4**	**7**	**4**	**132**	**42**	**89**	**52**	**1**	**1**	**410**
Clay	2	4	1	36	35	4	7	4	132	42	89	52	1	1	410
8	**0**	**1**	**0**	**3**	**5**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**38**	**9**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**1**	**63**
Carroll	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	7	3	0	1	0	0	14
Ray	0	0	0	2	4	0	1	0	31	6	0	4	0	1	49
9	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**11**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**18**
Chariton	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Linn	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	9	1	0	0	0	0	14
Sullivan	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
10	**1**	**2**	**1**	**10**	**7**	**2**	**10**	**0**	**31**	**49**	**4**	**12**	**0**	**0**	**129**
Marion	1	2	0	10	2	1	8	0	25	45	4	11	0	0	109
Monroe	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Ralls	0	0	1	0	2	0	2	0	6	4	0	1	0	0	16
11	**0**	**10**	**3**	**96**	**119**	**6**	**19**	**4**	**432**	**117**	**12**	**96**	**0**	**3**	**917**
St. Charles	0	10	3	96	119	6	19	4	432	117	12	96	0	3	917
12	**4**	**1**	**1**	**33**	**47**	**3**	**2**	**0**	**89**	**33**	**19**	**24**	**0**	**24**	**280**
Audrain	1	0	1	16	28	1	0	0	27	8	12	13	0	9	116
Montgomery	1	1	0	3	12	1	2	0	16	7	2	6	0	0	51
Warren	2	0	0	14	7	1	0	0	46	18	5	5	0	15	113
13	**19**	**30**	**2**	**104**	**156**	**7**	**6**	**0**	**339**	**163**	**27**	**32**	**0**	**8**	**893**
Boone	15	26	2	79	117	3	3	0	269	130	11	10	0	0	665
Callaway	4	4	0	25	39	4	3	0	70	33	16	22	0	8	228

Appendix G: Law Referrals by Level, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Felony A	Felony B	Felony C	Felony D	Felony E	Felony U	Infraction	Juvenile	Misdemeanor A	Misdemeanor B	Misdemeanor C	Misdemeanor D	Misdemeanor U	Ordinance	Total
14	**1**	**2**	**0**	**11**	**22**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**27**	**60**	**10**	**7**	**0**	**10**	**150**
Howard	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	8	7	0	2	0	1	23
Randolph	1	2	0	8	20	0	0	0	19	53	10	5	0	9	127
15	**2**	**1**	**3**	**23**	**21**	**5**	**1**	**1**	**178**	**34**	**4**	**16**	**1**	**43**	**333**
Lafayette	2	0	3	10	14	2	1	0	116	30	3	14	1	2	198
Saline	0	1	0	13	7	3	0	1	62	4	1	2	0	41	135
16	**60**	**101**	**9**	**265**	**132**	**28**	**6**	**0**	**370**	**50**	**18**	**38**	**0**	**6**	**1,083**
Jackson	60	101	9	265	132	28	6	0	370	50	18	38	0	6	1,083
17	**4**	**10**	**2**	**67**	**88**	**2**	**31**	**0**	**246**	**128**	**8**	**85**	**0**	**0**	**671**
Cass	3	7	1	57	65	1	27	0	150	99	8	72	0	0	490
Johnson	1	3	1	10	23	1	4	0	96	29	0	13	0	0	181
18	**6**	**11**	**1**	**57**	**56**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**179**	**62**	**20**	**52**	**1**	**0**	**445**
Cooper	0	4	0	19	18	0	0	0	105	38	6	21	0	0	211
Pettis	6	7	1	38	38	0	0	0	74	24	14	31	1	0	234
19	**1**	**4**	**0**	**27**	**25**	**1**	**3**	**0**	**107**	**42**	**7**	**57**	**0**	**0**	**274**
Cole	1	4	0	27	25	1	3	0	107	42	7	57	0	0	274
20	**4**	**4**	**0**	**32**	**38**	**8**	**3**	**0**	**107**	**46**	**22**	**115**	**0**	**2**	**381**
Franklin	2	1	0	24	29	5	3	0	96	42	20	104	0	1	327
Gasconade	1	2	0	3	3	1	0	0	6	2	1	6	0	1	26
Osage	1	1	0	5	6	2	0	0	5	2	1	5	0	0	28
21	**82**	**122**	**8**	**659**	**258**	**48**	**48**	**0**	**1,202**	**427**	**136**	**118**	**7**	**11**	**3,126**
St. Louis Co.	82	122	8	659	258	48	48	0	1,202	427	136	118	7	11	3,126
22	**77**	**44**	**4**	**244**	**95**	**16**	**1**	**0**	**305**	**55**	**8**	**25**	**0**	**55**	**929**
St. Louis City	77	44	4	244	95	16	1	0	305	55	8	25	0	55	929
23	**5**	**15**	**4**	**96**	**102**	**10**	**9**	**0**	**524**	**120**	**12**	**38**	**2**	**5**	**942**
Jefferson	5	15	4	96	102	10	9	0	524	120	12	38	2	5	942
24	**2**	**14**	**1**	**35**	**70**	**3**	**4**	**0**	**117**	**51**	**89**	**19**	**0**	**2**	**407**
Madison	0	3	0	2	13	0	0	0	11	8	2	2	0	0	41
St. Francois	1	3	0	18	39	3	4	0	63	28	73	8	0	0	240
Ste. Genevieve	1	0	1	3	6	0	0	0	25	2	4	5	0	2	49
Washington	0	8	0	12	12	0	0	0	18	13	10	4	0	0	77
25	**0**	**9**	**0**	**28**	**36**	**2**	**10**	**0**	**119**	**22**	**16**	**63**	**2**	**0**	**307**
Maries	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Phelps	0	3	0	8	8	0	0	0	15	4	0	7	2	0	47
Pulaski	0	6	0	14	19	2	8	0	96	9	16	41	0	0	211
Texas	0	0	0	6	8	0	2	0	8	9	0	15	0	0	48
26	**8**	**5**	**1**	**44**	**38**	**2**	**5**	**0**	**160**	**53**	**25**	**119**	**15**	**3**	**478**
Camden	1	1	0	11	4	1	1	0	36	7	2	41	0	2	107
Laclede	0	1	0	12	12	0	4	0	37	32	18	49	0	0	165
Miller	6	1	0	6	11	0	0	0	55	10	1	12	13	1	116
Moniteau	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	9	3	2	6	0	0	24
Morgan	1	2	0	14	9	1	0	0	23	1	2	11	2	0	66

Appendix G: Law Referrals by Level, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Felony A	Felony B	Felony C	Felony D	Felony E	Felony U	Infraction	Juvenile	Misdemeanor A	Misdemeanor B	Misdemeanor C	Misdemeanor D	Misdemeanor U	Ordinance	Total
27	**2**	**0**	**3**	**17**	**29**	**2**	**5**	**0**	**44**	**27**	**15**	**24**	**0**	**12**	**180**
Bates	0	0	1	3	2	0	2	0	9	1	7	5	0	0	30
Benton	2	0	1	2	8	1	0	0	7	6	1	6	0	2	36
Henry	0	0	1	10	17	1	3	0	18	13	4	8	0	9	84
St. Clair	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	10	7	3	5	0	1	30
28	**6**	**7**	**2**	**33**	**57**	**1**	**29**	**0**	**114**	**45**	**9**	**38**	**2**	**0**	**343**
Barton	0	0	0	2	6	0	2	0	9	9	1	3	0	0	32
Cedar	1	0	0	7	18	0	8	0	14	7	2	4	1	0	62
Dade	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	5	1	0	2	1	0	14
Vernon	5	6	2	20	33	1	19	0	86	28	6	29	0	0	235
29	**2**	**3**	**0**	**31**	**54**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**105**	**52**	**7**	**15**	**1**	**0**	**273**
Jasper	2	3	0	31	54	3	0	0	105	52	7	15	1	0	273
30	**5**	**7**	**2**	**43**	**30**	**9**	**5**	**0**	**155**	**37**	**53**	**23**	**0**	**41**	**410**
Dallas	1	0	0	6	3	0	0	0	41	10	3	6	0	1	71
Hickory	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	6	0	0	4	15
Polk	3	2	0	18	13	7	5	0	62	15	43	11	0	36	215
Webster	1	5	2	18	14	2	0	0	48	12	1	6	0	0	109
31	**5**	**14**	**2**	**56**	**48**	**8**	**0**	**0**	**70**	**25**	**32**	**29**	**0**	**0**	**289**
Greene	5	14	2	56	48	8	0	0	70	25	32	29	0	0	289
32	**17**	**11**	**3**	**37**	**64**	**10**	**26**	**6**	**126**	**37**	**11**	**33**	**1**	**36**	**418**
Bollinger	0	3	0	1	1	0	0	0	3	0	3	0	0	7	18
Cape Girardeau	17	7	3	35	56	10	7	1	101	33	8	30	1	20	329
Perry	0	1	0	1	7	0	19	5	22	4	0	3	0	9	71
33	**0**	**4**	**1**	**46**	**38**	**1**	**5**	**1**	**105**	**51**	**12**	**32**	**0**	**8**	**304**
Mississippi	0	0	0	11	8	1	1	0	22	7	1	6	0	0	57
Scott	0	4	1	35	30	0	4	1	83	44	11	26	0	8	247
34	**0**	**7**	**1**	**27**	**24**	**2**	**3**	**0**	**54**	**30**	**4**	**29**	**1**	**0**	**182**
New Madrid	0	0	0	9	9	0	3	0	16	7	2	9	0	0	55
Pemiscot	0	7	1	18	15	2	0	0	38	23	2	20	1	0	127
35	**4**	**7**	**1**	**26**	**45**	**2**	**1**	**0**	**64**	**72**	**24**	**27**	**1**	**5**	**279**
Dunklin	3	6	0	14	22	1	0	0	28	15	11	12	0	5	117
Stoddard	1	1	1	12	23	1	1	0	36	57	13	15	1	0	162
36	**9**	**6**	**7**	**58**	**68**	**3**	**7**	**0**	**141**	**47**	**2**	**46**	**0**	**0**	**394**
Carter	0	0	0	4	8	0	0	0	6	1	0	2	0	0	21
Butler	9	6	7	50	57	2	6	0	128	39	2	44	0	0	350
Ripley	0	0	0	4	3	1	1	0	7	7	0	0	0	0	23
37	**7**	**6**	**3**	**17**	**48**	**5**	**30**	**0**	**26**	**21**	**6**	**7**	**2**	**3**	**181**
Howell	7	5	1	10	31	3	26	0	21	17	4	5	0	3	133
Oregon	0	0	2	7	15	1	4	0	3	1	2	2	2	0	39
Shannon	0	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	9
38	**4**	**5**	**1**	**43**	**53**	**7**	**8**	**0**	**122**	**29**	**22**	**82**	**0**	**0**	**376**
Christian	4	5	1	43	53	7	8	0	122	29	22	82	0	0	376
39	**3**	**10**	**8**	**31**	**25**	**4**	**6**	**0**	**122**	**30**	**1**	**71**	**42**	**3**	**356**
Barry	0	9	2	3	8	0	4	0	30	8	0	20	19	0	103
Lawrence	2	0	4	10	6	4	2	0	63	11	1	27	16	0	146
Stone	1	1	2	18	11	0	0	0	29	11	0	24	7	3	107

Appendix G: Law Referrals by Level, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Felony A	Felony B	Felony C	Felony D	Felony E	Felony U	Infraction	Juvenile	Misdemeanor A	Misdemeanor B	Misdemeanor C	Misdemeanor D	Misdemeanor U	Ordinance	Total
40	**2**	**11**	**3**	**64**	**52**	**2**	**11**	**0**	**149**	**58**	**6**	**68**	**3**	**0**	**429**
McDonald	0	7	0	28	39	0	2	0	38	9	1	26	0	0	150
Newton	2	4	3	36	13	2	9	0	111	49	5	42	3	0	279
41	**0**	**0**	**1**	**3**	**3**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**6**	**14**	**1**	**2**	**0**	**13**	**45**
Macon	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	2	1	1	2	0	9	19
Shelby	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	4	13	0	0	0	4	26
42	**0**	**3**	**1**	**13**	**18**	**1**	**11**	**1**	**30**	**9**	**3**	**21**	**3**	**0**	**114**
Crawford	0	1	1	3	1	0	1	0	3	4	1	9	0	0	24
Dent	0	2	0	8	12	0	7	1	5	2	2	5	0	0	44
Iron	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	3
Reynolds	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	3	0	0	1	1	0	8
Wayne	0	0	0	1	5	0	1	0	19	1	0	6	2	0	35
43	**0**	**7**	**2**	**20**	**18**	**1**	**12**	**0**	**53**	**13**	**9**	**40**	**0**	**0**	**175**
Caldwell	0	0	0	4	3	0	1	0	5	4	2	5	0	0	24
Clinton	0	2	0	4	3	1	0	0	17	3	1	12	0	0	43
Daviess	0	5	0	3	3	0	2	0	3	0	1	5	0	0	22
DeKalb	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	10	0	1	2	0	0	18
Livingston	0	0	0	8	7	0	9	0	18	6	4	16	0	0	68
44	**2**	**1**	**0**	**12**	**18**	**0**	**6**	**0**	**17**	**6**	**7**	**23**	**0**	**0**	**92**
Douglas	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	5	1	0	3	0	0	15
Ozark	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	4	0	0	9
Wright	2	1	0	9	12	0	6	0	10	5	7	16	0	0	68
45	**0**	**0**	**1**	**15**	**21**	**6**	**3**	**0**	**68**	**42**	**4**	**39**	**0**	**0**	**199**
Lincoln	0	0	0	12	16	4	2	0	50	29	4	31	0	0	148
Pike	0	0	1	3	5	2	1	0	18	13	0	8	0	0	51
46	**6**	**4**	**1**	**19**	**42**	**5**	**2**	**0**	**109**	**25**	**8**	**45**	**0**	**0**	**266**
Taney	6	4	1	19	42	5	2	0	109	25	8	45	0	0	266
Statewide Total	**361**	**517**	**87**	**2,557**	**2,181**	**230**	**398**	**18**	**6,611**	**2,330**	**827**	**1,817**	**86**	**329**	**18,349**

Appendix H: CA/N Referrals by Type, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Juvenile Abuse	Juvenile Request for Protective Custody	Juvenile Neglect	Total
1	**31**	**6**	**44**	**81**
Clark	16	1	24	41
Schuyler	5	1	7	13
Scotland	10	4	13	27
2	**4**	**1**	**81**	**86**
Adair	3	1	47	51
Knox	0	0	12	12
Lewis	1	0	22	23
3	**30**	**5**	**213**	**248**
Grundy	12	0	104	116
Harrison	5	4	65	74
Mercer	3	0	6	9
Putnam	10	1	38	49
4	**5**	**1**	**171**	**177**
Atchison	3	0	17	20
Gentry	0	0	8	8
Holt	1	0	35	36
Nodaway	1	1	109	111
Worth	0	0	2	2
5	**53**	**0**	**38**	**91**
Andrew	2	0	6	8
Buchanan	51		32	83
6	**4**	**0**	**15**	**19**
Platte	4		15	19
7	**14**	**21**	**274**	**309**
Clay	14	21	274	309
8	**13**	**0**	**13**	**26**
Carroll	2	0	1	3
Ray	11	0	12	23
9	**2**	**1**	**52**	**55**
Chariton	2	0	9	11
Linn	0	1	24	25
Sullivan	0	0	19	19
10	**1**	**2**	**28**	**31**
Marion	1	2	20	23
Monroe	0	0	6	6
Ralls	0	0	2	2
11	**7**	**76**	**108**	**191**
St. Charles	7	76	108	191
12	**43**	**1**	**197**	**241**
Audrain	23	0	37	60
Montgomery	12	0	79	91
Warren	8	1	81	90
13	**1**	**14**	**241**	**256**
Boone	0	10	150	160
Callaway	1	4	91	96

Appendix H: CA/N Referrals by Type, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Juvenile Abuse	Juvenile Request for Protective Custody	Juvenile Neglect	Total
14	**109**	**0**	**157**	**266**
Howard	23	0	37	60
Randolph	86	0	120	206
15	**2**	**14**	**9**	**25**
Lafayette	2	0	9	11
Saline	0	14	0	14
16	**201**	**170**	**542**	**913**
Jackson	201	170	542	913
17	**1**	**23**	**390**	**414**
Cass	1	19	303	323
Johnson	0	4	87	91
18	**15**	**12**	**72**	**99**
Cooper	14	11	37	62
Pettis	1	1	35	37
19	**23**	**0**	**61**	**84**
Cole	23	0	61	84
20	**0**	**0**	**123**	**123**
Franklin	0	0	89	89
Gasconade	0	0	17	17
Osage	0	0	17	17
21	**125**	**176**	**355**	**656**
St. Louis Co.	125	176	355	656
22	**19**	**42**	**264**	**325**
St. Louis City	19	42	264	325
23	**51**	**74**	**125**	**250**
Jefferson	51	74	125	250
24	**11**	**0**	**157**	**168**
Madison	2	0	10	12
St. Francois	6	0	88	94
Ste. Genevieve	1	0	27	28
Washington	2	0	32	34
25	**246**	**8**	**620**	**874**
Maries	1	0	12	13
Phelps	9	6	184	199
Pulaski	181	1	286	468
Texas	55	1	138	194
26	**85**	**235**	**125**	**445**
Camden	20	37	24	81
Laclede	26	121	47	194
Miller	19	49	23	91
Moniteau	3	1	7	11
Morgan	17	27	24	68
27	**34**	**5**	**312**	**351**
Bates	8	0	98	106
Benton	6	3	71	80
Henry	14	2	112	128
St. Clair	6	0	31	37

Appendix H: CA/N Referrals by Type, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Juvenile Abuse	Juvenile Request for Protective Custody	Juvenile Neglect	Total
28	**3**	**0**	**166**	**169**
Barton	0	0	36	36
Cedar	1	0	38	39
Dade	0	0	10	10
Vernon	2	0	82	84
29	**23**	**1**	**154**	**178**
Jasper	23	1	154	178
30	**51**	**14**	**242**	**307**
Dallas	13	0	42	55
Hickory	0	2	7	9
Polk	12	9	32	53
Webster	26	3	161	190
31	**55**	**68**	**305**	**428**
Greene	55	68	305	428
32	**38**	**3**	**293**	**334**
Bollinger	13	0	3	16
Cape Girardeau	25	3	213	241
Perry	0	0	77	77
33	**0**	**0**	**70**	**70**
Mississippi	0	0	42	42
Scott	0	0	28	28
34	**30**	**5**	**94**	**129**
New Madrid	15	1	32	48
Pemiscot	15	4	62	81
35	**14**	**34**	**249**	**297**
Dunklin	5	0	81	86
Stoddard	9	34	168	211
36	**1**	**2**	**197**	**200**
Carter	0	0	8	8
Butler	1	0	162	163
Ripley	0	2	27	29
37	**6**	**49**	**34**	**89**
Howell	6	24	28	58
Oregon	0	14	1	15
Shannon	0	11	5	16
38	**81**	**1**	**174**	**256**
Christian	81	1	174	256
39	**16**	**68**	**196**	**280**
Barry	7	20	153	180
Lawrence	4	27	24	55
Stone	5	21	19	45
40	**52**	**11**	**231**	**294**
McDonald	22	4	86	112
Newton	30	7	145	182

Appendix H: CA/N Referrals by Type, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Juvenile Abuse	Juvenile Request for Protective Custody	Juvenile Neglect	Total
41	**4**	**2**	**51**	**57**
Macon	2	0	38	40
Shelby	2	2	13	17
42	**18**	**1**	**137**	**156**
Crawford	1	0	28	29
Dent	12	0	26	38
Iron	0	0	29	29
Reynolds	5	0	26	31
Wayne	0	1	28	29
43	**72**	**1**	**81**	**154**
Caldwell	10	0	12	22
Clinton	9	1	5	15
Daviess	6	0	5	11
DeKalb	8	0	2	10
Livingston	39	0	57	96
44	**5**	**1**	**62**	**68**
Douglas	0	0	15	15
Ozark	0	0	4	4
Wright	5	1	43	49
45	**109**	**6**	**112**	**227**
Lincoln	109	6	108	223
Pike	0	0	4	4
46	**6**	**20**	**127**	**153**
Taney	6	20	127	153
Statewide Total	**1,714**	**1,174**	**7,762**	**10,650**

Appendix I: Status Referrals by Violation, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Behavior Injurious To Self/Others	Beyond Parental Control	Habitually Absent From Home	Municipal - Curfew	Municipal- Possession/ Use of a Tobacco Product	Status Offense - Other	Truancy	Total
1	**99**	**8**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**41**	**148**
Clark	44	5	0	0	0	0	33	82
Schuyler	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	20
Scotland	36	3	0	0	0	0	7	46
2	**45**	**37**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**5**	**48**	**139**
Adair	22	13	4	0	0	1	35	75
Knox	3	9	0	0	0	0	5	17
Lewis	20	15	0	0	0	4	8	47
3	**53**	**10**	**12**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**50**	**125**
Grundy	29	3	10	0	0	0	42	84
Harrison	5	0	1	0	0	0	3	9
Mercer	1	1	1	0	0	0	2	5
Putnam	18	6	0	0	0	0	3	27
4	**67**	**120**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**65**	**253**
Atchison	4	15	0	0	0	0	11	30
Gentry	9	13	0	0	0	0	3	25
Holt	10	25	0	0	0	0	5	40
Nodaway	42	66	0	0	0	1	46	155
Worth	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
5	**158**	**102**	**86**	**0**	**6**	**3**	**56**	**411**
Andrew	21	13	8	0	0	0	0	42
Buchanan	137	89	78	0	6	3	56	369
6	**31**	**4**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**27**	**64**
Platte	31	4	2	0	0	0	27	64
7	**1**	**5**	**3**	**1**	**0**	**4**	**22**	**36**
Clay	1	5	3	1	0	4	22	36
8	**54**	**2**	**17**	**8**	**0**	**0**	**30**	**111**
Carroll	7	0	2	0	0	0	2	11
Ray	47	2	15	8	0	0	28	100
9	**106**	**2**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**31**	**142**
Chariton	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	42
Linn	51	2	3	0	0	0	4	60
Sullivan	14	0	0	0	0	0	26	40
10	**6**	**42**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**42**	**29**	**119**
Marion	6	34	0	0	0	31	28	99
Monroe	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Ralls	0	8	0	0	0	10	0	18
11	**14**	**1**	**182**	**23**	**1**	**0**	**41**	**262**
St. Charles	14	1	182	23	1	0	41	262
12	**110**	**35**	**61**	**0**	**0**	**56**	**24**	**286**
Audrain	41	17	57	0	0	26	10	151
Montgomery	38	8	2	0	0	21	5	74
Warren	31	10	2	0	0	9	9	61

Appendix I: Status Referrals by Violation, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Behavior Injurious To Self/Others	Beyond Parental Control	Habitually Absent From Home	Municipal - Curfew	Municipal- Possession/ Use of a Tobacco Product	Status Offense - Other	Truancy	Total
13	**622**	**241**	**37**	**1**	**0**	**3**	**155**	**1,059**
Boone	549	106	1	0	0	0	93	749
Callaway	73	135	36	1	0	3	62	310
14	**306**	**23**	**29**	**9**	**0**	**0**	**93**	**460**
Howard	48	4	2	0	0	0	17	71
Randolph	258	19	27	9	0	0	76	389
15	**69**	**73**	**31**	**0**	**29**	**16**	**43**	**261**
Lafayette	51	33	21	0	0	16	25	146
Saline	18	40	10	0	29	0	18	115
16	**46**	**2**	**21**	**0**	**0**	**13**	**4**	**86**
Jackson	46	2	21	0	0	13	4	86
17	**472**	**29**	**20**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**104**	**626**
Cass	289	0	10	0	0	1	78	378
Johnson	183	29	10	0	0	0	26	248
18	**144**	**64**	**22**	**0**	**0**	**9**	**23**	**262**
Cooper	93	28	4	0	0	0	17	142
Pettis	51	36	18	0	0	9	6	120
19	**35**	**70**	**42**	**4**	**0**	**2**	**6**	**159**
Cole	35	70	42	4	0	2	6	159
20	**36**	**21**	**8**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**27**	**95**
Franklin	31	20	8	0	0	2	25	86
Gasconade	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	6
Osage	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	3
21	**27**	**8**	**668**	**78**	**5**	**35**	**233**	**1,054**
St. Louis Co.	27	8	668	78	5	35	233	1,054
22	**11**	**0**	**74**	**10**	**0**	**2**	**56**	**153**
St. Louis City	11	0	74	10	0	2	56	153
23	**220**	**22**	**117**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**205**	**565**
Jefferson	220	22	117	1	0	0	205	565
24	**41**	**42**	**43**	**0**	**0**	**58**	**31**	**215**
Madison	2	0	2	0	0	2	3	9
St. Francois	17	21	12	0	0	34	10	94
Ste. Genevieve	14	13	12	0	0	4	13	56
Washington	8	8	17	0	0	18	5	56
25	**479**	**16**	**57**	**6**	**0**	**2**	**169**	**729**
Maries	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	13
Phelps	148	4	6	0	0	0	54	212
Pulaski	218	10	41	0	0	2	57	328
Texas	108	2	10	6	0	0	50	176
26	**96**	**63**	**25**	**0**	**0**	**17**	**107**	**308**
Camden	56	4	1	0	0	1	10	72
Laclede	26	24	6	0	0	11	61	128
Miller	7	11	6	0	0	1	17	42
Moniteau	2	8	6	0	0	3	8	27
Morgan	5	16	6	0	0	1	11	39

Appendix I: Status Referrals by Violation, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Behavior Injurious To Self/Others	Beyond Parental Control	Habitually Absent From Home	Municipal - Curfew	Municipal- Possession/ Use of a Tobacco Product	Status Offense - Other	Truancy	Total
27	**145**	**49**	**22**	**2**	**0**	**3**	**56**	**277**
Bates	31	10	1	2	0	2	23	69
Benton	28	13	1	0	0	0	12	54
Henry	40	19	14	0	0	1	12	86
St. Clair	46	7	6	0	0	0	9	68
28	**97**	**91**	**23**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**86**	**298**
Barton	10	14	0	0	0	0	9	33
Cedar	8	11	8	0	0	0	33	60
Dade	22	1	1	0	0	0	0	24
Vernon	57	65	14	1	0	0	44	181
29	**27**	**1**	**39**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**8**	**79**
Jasper	27	1	39	0	0	4	8	79
30	**35**	**35**	**52**	**0**	**0**	**9**	**36**	**167**
Dallas	10	22	13	0	0	0	3	48
Hickory	3	3	1	0	0	0	9	16
Polk	7	8	36	0	0	8	4	63
Webster	15	2	2	0	0	1	20	40
31	**15**	**1**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**19**
Greene	15	1	3	0	0	0	0	19
32	**223**	**13**	**82**	**7**	**16**	**2**	**429**	**772**
Bollinger	71	0	0	0	0	2	53	126
Cape Girardeau	62	12	77	7	0	0	352	510
Perry	90	1	5	0	16	0	24	136
33	**54**	**22**	**16**	**9**	**0**	**1**	**3**	**105**
Mississippi	4	4	4	0	0	0	3	15
Scott	50	18	12	9	0	1	0	90
34	**129**	**66**	**36**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**24**	**256**
New Madrid	52	16	13	0	0	1	16	98
Pemiscot	77	50	23	0	0	0	8	158
35	**50**	**52**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**112**	**145**	**361**
Dunklin	11	44	2	0	0	37	107	201
Stoddard	39	8	0	0	0	75	38	160
36	**16**	**36**	**82**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**135**
Carter	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Butler	16	28	79	0	0	0	1	124
Ripley	0	5	3	0	0	0	0	8
37	**17**	**37**	**28**	**0**	**0**	**11**	**74**	**167**
Howell	11	30	14	0	0	11	58	124
Oregon	3	4	12	0	0	0	1	20
Shannon	3	3	2	0	0	0	15	23
38	**439**	**36**	**6**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**13**	**494**
Christian	439	36	6	0	0	0	13	494

Appendix I: Status Referrals by Violation, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Behavior Injurious To Self/Others	Beyond Parental Control	Habitually Absent From Home	Municipal - Curfew	Municipal- Possession/ Use of a Tobacco Product	Status Offense - Other	Truancy	Total
39	**144**	**50**	**56**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**251**
Barry	29	20	5	0	0	0	0	54
Lawrence	75	19	30	0	0	1	0	125
Stone	40	11	21	0	0	0	0	72
40	**80**	**72**	**59**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**22**	**236**
McDonald	33	25	9	0	0	0	11	78
Newton	47	47	50	0	0	3	11	158
41	**53**	**15**	**2**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**36**	**109**
Macon	26	9	2	0	0	0	33	70
Shelby	27	6	0	0	3	0	3	39
42	**53**	**46**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7**	**46**	**152**
Crawford	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
Dent	25	16	0	0	0	0	41	82
Iron	17	8	0	0	0	2	4	31
Reynolds	0	10	0	0	0	1	1	12
Wayne	11	7	0	0	0	4	0	22
43	**48**	**8**	**20**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**27**	**106**
Caldwell	9	1	3	0	0	0	3	16
Clinton	10	2	0	0	0	3	11	26
Daviess	5	1	1	0	0	0	4	11
DeKalb	5	0	2	0	0	0	0	7
Livingston	19	4	14	0	0	0	9	46
44	**3**	**8**	**6**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**15**	**32**
Douglas	1	2	0	0	0	0	4	7
Ozark	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	7
Wright	2	5	6	0	0	0	5	18
45	**80**	**1**	**28**	**8**	**1**	**3**	**161**	**282**
Lincoln	71	1	21	6	1	3	149	252
Pike	9	0	7	2	0	0	12	30
46	**48**	**29**	**31**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**112**
Taney	48	29	31	0	0	0	4	112
Statewide Total	**5,104**	**1,710**	**2,157**	**168**	**61**	**432**	**2,906**	**12,538**

Appendix J: Administrative Referrals by Violation, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Juvenile Formal Supervision/ Technical Violation	Juvenile Informal Supervision/ Technical Violation	Probation/ Parole Violation	Probation Violation	Violation Of Valid Court Order	Total
3	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Harrison	0	1	0	0	0	1
4	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**4**
Nodaway	0	3	0	0	1	4
5	**4**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**8**	**12**
Andrew	0	0	0	0	2	2
Buchanan	4	0	0	0	6	10
6	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**2**
Platte	0	0	0	0	2	2
7	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Clay	1	0	0	0	0	1
8	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Ray	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	**8**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6**	**14**
St. Charles	8	0	0	0	6	14
14	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**3**
Howard	0	0	0	0	2	2
Randolph	1	0	0	0	0	1
15	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Lafayette	0	0	1	0	0	1
16	**2**	**140**	**0**	**0**	**34**	**176**
Jackson	2	140	0	0	34	176
18	**0**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**2**
Cooper	0	0	1	0	0	1
Pettis	0	1	0	0	0	1
19	**1**	**2**	**2**	**1**	**1**	**7**
Cole	1	2	2	1	1	7
21	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**166**	**166**
St. Louis Co.	0	0	0	0	166	166
22	**38**	**18**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**59**
St. Louis City	38	18	0	0	3	59
25	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**
Pulaski	0	0	0	1	0	1
26	**5**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**5**
Camden	1	0	0	0	0	1
Morgan	4	0	0	0	0	4
28	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**
Vernon	3	0	0	0	0	3
29	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1**
Jasper	0	0	0	0	1	1
30	**2**	**14**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**16**
Dallas	0	1	0	0	0	1
Hickory	1	0	0	0	0	1
Polk	1	13	0	0	0	14

Appendix J: Administrative Referrals by Violation, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Juvenile Formal Supervision/ Technical Violation	Juvenile Informal Supervision/ Technical Violation	Probation/ Parole Violation	Probation Violation	Violation Of Valid Court Order	Total
33	**1**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
Mississippi	1	0	0	0	0	1
Scott	0	1	0	0	0	1
34	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
Pemiscot	0	1	0	0	0	1
37	**7**	**9**	**0**	**35**	**0**	**51**
Howell	2	8	0	25	0	35
Oregon	0	1	0	10	0	11
Shannon	5	0	0	0	0	5
39	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**2**
Barry	0	0	0	0	2	2
40	**0**	**0**	**78**	**0**	**0**	**78**
McDonald	0	0	78	0	0	78
43	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**2**
Livingston	0	0	0	0	2	2
45	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
Lincoln	2	0	0	0	0	2
Statewide Total	**75**	**190**	**82**	**37**	**228**	**612**

Appendix K: Out of Home Placements by Circuit

Circuit	Court Residental Care Cases	Court Residental Care %	DMH Cases	DMH %	CD Cases	CD %	DYS* Cases	DYS* %	Relative Cases	Relative %	Private Agency Cases	Private Agency %	Public Agency Cases	Public Agency %	Other Cases	Other %	Total Cases
1	0	0%	0	0%	22	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	**22**
2	0	0%	0	0%	63	95%	0	0%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	1	2%	**66**
3	0	0%	0	0%	30	75%	10	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	**40**
4	3	6%	0	0%	45	88%	0	0%	2	4%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	**51**
5	29	41%	0	0%	28	39%	12	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	3%	**71**
6	0	0%	0	0%	11	46%	11	46%	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	1	4%	**24**
7	0	0%	0	0%	97	79%	20	16%	0	0%	0	0%	6	5%	0	0%	**123**
8	0	0%	0	0%	7	70%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	20%	**10**
9	0	0%	0	0%	26	87%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	10%	**30**
10	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	**1**
11	0	0%	0	0%	116	84%	17	12%	3	2%	1	1%	0	0%	1	1%	**138**
12	3	3%	0	0%	63	72%	16	18%	5	6%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	**88**
13	0	0%	0	0%	199	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	**200**
14	1	1%	0	0%	90	66%	14	10%	31	23%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	**137**
15	0	0%	0	0%	17	47%	19	53%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	**36**
16	40	13%	0	0%	232	73%	37	12%	7	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3	1%	**319**
17	0	0%	0	0%	136	71%	13	7%	27	14%	2	1%	4	2%	10	5%	**192**
18	0	0%	0	0%	26	57%	10	22%	2	4%	8	17%	0	0%	0	0%	**46**
19	0	0%	0	0%	56	97%	2	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	**58**
20	1	1%	0	0%	111	85%	13	10%	3	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3	2%	**131**
21	0	0%	0	0%	245	89%	18	7%	4	1%	0	0%	0	0%	7	3%	**274**
22	1	0%	0	0%	222	77%	61	21%	3	1%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	**288**
23	1	0%	0	0%	59	28%	39	19%	95	46%	5	2%	0	0%	9	4%	**208**
24	0	0%	0	0%	127	79%	21	13%	8	5%	4	3%	0	0%	0	0%	**160**
25	6	3%	0	0%	127	56%	5	2%	83	37%	0	0%	2	1%	3	1%	**226**
26	1	1%	0	0%	113	82%	7	5%	0	0%	0	0%	8	6%	9	7%	**138**
27	0	0%	0	0%	72	92%	0	0%	4	5%	1	1%	0	0%	1	1%	**78**
28	0	0%	0	0%	12	67%	6	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	**18**
29	1	1%	0	0%	117	79%	12	8%	18	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	**148**
30	3	3%	0	0%	54	60%	9	10%	0	0%	7	8%	0	0%	17	19%	**90**
31	2	1%	0	0%	210	61%	17	5%	70	20%	0	0%	46	13%	1	0%	**346**
32	0	0%	0	0%	63	79%	17	21%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	**80**
33	1	1%	0	0%	44	50%	16	18%	13	15%	0	0%	7	8%	7	8%	**88**
34	0	0%	1	1%	68	81%	1	1%	0	0%	1	1%	13	15%	0	0%	**84**
35	1	1%	0	0%	103	94%	3	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	2%	**109**
36	0	0%	0	0%	65	52%	15	12%	44	35%	0	0%	0	0%	2	2%	**126**
37	0	0%	0	0%	46	90%	1	2%	0	0%	4	8%	0	0%	0	0%	**51**
38	0	0%	0	0%	84	71%	31	26%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	3	3%	**119**
39	0	0%	1	1%	61	80%	6	8%	6	8%	0	0%	0	0%	2	3%	**76**
40	5	3%	0	0%	95	62%	10	7%	31	20%	0	0%	0	0%	12	8%	**153**
41	0	0%	0	0%	29	97%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	**30**
42	1	1%	0	0%	109	97%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	1	1%	**112**
43	1	1%	0	0%	62	86%	4	6%	0	0%	3	4%	2	3%	0	0%	**72**
44	0	0%	0	0%	60	98%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	**61**
45	0	0%	0	0%	27	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	**27**
46	0	0%	0	0%	117	86%	12	9%	7	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	**136**
Total	**101**	**2%**	**2**	**0%**	**3,767**	**74%**	**509**	**10%**	**468**	**9%**	**40**	**1%**	**91**	**2%**	**103**	**2%**	**5,081**

***Might not match DYS Commitment Counts**

Department of Mental Health (DMH), Childern's Division (CD), and Division of Youth Services (DYS)

Appendix L: In Home Services by Circuit

Circuit	Supervision By Court Cases	Supervision By Court %	DMH Cases	DMH %	CD Cases	CD %	DYS Cases	DYS %	Private Agency Cases	Private Agency %	Public Agency Cases	Public Agency %	Other Cases	Other %	Total Cases
1	63	78%	0	0%	5	6%	0	0%	7	9%	0	0%	6	7%	**81**
2	100	78%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	25	19%	2	2%	2	2%	**129**
3	62	63%	1	1%	35	36%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	**98**
4	116	63%	24	13%	4	2%	0	0%	11	6%	15	8%	13	7%	**183**
5	206	95%	0	0%	11	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	**217**
6	155	91%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	15	9%	**170**
7	168	99%	0	0%	2	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	**170**
8	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	**2**
9	7	50%	0	0%	6	43%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	7%	**14**
10	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	**0**
11	404	54%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	259	35%	78	10%	2	0%	**743**
12	119	72%	8	5%	29	18%	0	0%	1	1%	7	4%	1	1%	**165**
13	233	99%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	1%	**235**
14	41	76%	0	0%	8	15%	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	4	7%	**54**
15	32	67%	9	19%	5	10%	0	0%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	**48**
16	114	84%	0	0%	19	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	1%	**135**
17	379	98%	0	0%	8	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	**387**
18	63	74%	11	13%	3	4%	0	0%	8	9%	0	0%	0	0%	**85**
19	1	7%	0	0%	13	93%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	**14**
20	63	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	**63**
21	155	93%	1	1%	6	4%	1	1%	1	1%	1	1%	2	1%	**167**
22	134	99%	0	0%	2	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	**136**
23	291	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	**291**
24	47	67%	23	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	**70**
25	20	80%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	2	8%	2	8%	**25**
26	51	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	**51**
27	173	53%	27	8%	69	21%	0	0%	4	1%	37	11%	15	5%	**325**
28	66	97%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	**68**
29	48	59%	0	0%	30	37%	0	0%	1	1%	1	1%	1	1%	**81**
30	27	87%	0	0%	3	10%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	**31**
31	45	82%	0	0%	9	16%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	**55**
32	35	80%	0	0%	8	18%	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%	**44**
33	32	68%	0	0%	7	15%	0	0%	1	2%	7	15%	0	0%	**47**
34	32	70%	3	7%	0	0%	0	0%	4	9%	0	0%	7	15%	**46**
35	192	88%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	27	12%	**219**
36	110	38%	0	0%	18	6%	0	0%	5	2%	4	1%	149	52%	**286**
37	48	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	**48**
38	139	95%	0	0%	4	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	2%	**146**
39	43	73%	11	19%	2	3%	1	2%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	**59**
40	168	97%	0	0%	2	1%	4	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	**174**
41	35	88%	0	0%	5	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	**40**
42	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	**0**
43	15	83%	0	0%	0	0%	1	6%	0	0%	1	6%	1	6%	**18**
44	5	83%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	17%	**6**
45	13	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	**13**
46	55	74%	0	0%	14	19%	0	0%	4	5%	1	1%	0	0%	**74**
Total	**4,306**	**78%**	**118**	**2%**	**330**	**6%**	**7**	**0%**	**335**	**6%**	**160**	**3%**	**257**	**5%**	**5,513**

Department of Mental Health (DMH), Childern's Division (CD), and Division of Youth Services (DYS)

Appendix M: Commitments to DYS by Circuit, Race, and Gender

Circuit	White Male	White Female	Black Male	Black Female	Hispanic Male	Hispanic Female	Native American Male	Native American Female	Asian / Pacific Islander Male	Asian / Pacific Islander Female	Total
1	2	1									**3**
2	1										**1**
3	7			1		1					**9**
4	1										**1**
5	6		2								**8**
6	5		2	2		1					**10**
7	3		5		1						**9**
8	2		1								**3**
9	1	1									**2**
10	4										**4**
11	4	1	8								**13**
12	3	1	1								**5**
13	6		19	5							**30**
14	3	1	1								**5**
15	8	5	2								**15**
16	2		24	1	1						**28**
17	8	5	5	1							**19**
18	7	2	3						1		**13**
19	1		4	1							**6**
20	3	1									**4**
21	1		13	1							**15**
22			40	4							**44**
23	15	3	1	1	2						**22**
24	18	5									**23**
25	3	1	2	2							**8**
26	12	7	4		1						**24**
27	3	1									**4**
28	7	2	4		1	2					**16**
29	5	1	1	1	1						**9**
30	11	7	15		3						**36**
31	2		7	2	1					1	**13**
32	10	3	11	2							**26**
33	2		4	2							**8**
34	9	1	5	1	1						**17**
35	8		3								**11**
36	3	1		2							**6**
37	9	1									**10**
38	3			1	1						**5**
39	12				3			1			**16**
40	2	2						1			**5**
41	1										**1**
42	3	2	2								**7**
43	4										**4**
44	5										**5**
45	11	5									**16**
46				1							**1**
Total	**236**	**60**	**189**	**31**	**16**	**4**	**0**	**2**	**1**	**1**	**540**

Appendix N: Certification to Adult Court by Circuit, Race, and Gender

Circuit	White Male	White Female	Black Male	Black Female	Hispanic Male	Hispanic Female	Other Male	Other Female	Total
4		1							**1**
5	2		1						**3**
6	2								**2**
7	1		3						**4**
11			2						**2**
13	1		8						**9**
15						1			**1**
16	2		9						**11**
17			1						**1**
18					2				**2**
19	1		2						**3**
21			21	1					**22**
22	1		15	1					**17**
24	4								**4**
25	1		1						**2**
31	2		1		1				**4**
33			3						**3**
34			4						**4**
35			2						**2**
39	3								**3**
40	1								**1**
45	1								**1**
Total	**22**	**1**	**73**	**2**	**3**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**102**

Appendix O: Standard 2.3 Preliminary Inquiry of Delinquency Referrals within a Thirty Day Time Period

Circuit/County	Total Referrals Filed	Standard Met	Percent Standard Met
1	**48**	**45**	**94%**
Clark	26	25	96%
Schuyler	14	13	93%
Scotland	8	7	88%
2	**66**	**62**	**94%**
Adair	40	39	98%
Knox	0	0	NA
Lewis	26	23	88%
3	**73**	**70**	**96%**
Grundy	33	33	100%
Harrison	15	12	80%
Mercer	4	4	100%
Putnam	21	21	100%
4	**67**	**60**	**90%**
Atchison	3	2	67%
Gentry	10	10	100%
Holt	3	3	100%
Nodaway	51	45	88%
Worth	0	0	NA
5	**303**	**137**	**45%**
Andrew	22	6	27%
Buchanan	281	131	47%
6	**246**	**196**	**80%**
Platte	246	196	80%
7	**547**	**249**	**46%**
Clay	547	249	46%
8	**72**	**52**	**72%**
Carroll	14	12	86%
Ray	58	40	69%
9	**19**	**10**	**53%**
Chariton	3	3	100%
Linn	16	7	44%
Sullivan	0	0	NA
10	**146**	**137**	**94%**
Marion	126	119	94%
Monroe	5	4	80%
Ralls	15	14	93%
11	**899**	**475**	**53%**
St. Charles	899	475	53%

Appendix O: Standard 2.3 Preliminary Inquiry of Delinquency Referrals within a Thirty Day Time Period

Circuit/County	Total Referrals Filed	Standard Met	Percent Standard Met
12	**272**	**168**	**62%**
Audrain	125	75	60%
Montgomery	42	33	79%
Warren	105	60	57%
13	**875**	**550**	**63%**
Boone	639	398	62%
Callaway	236	152	64%
14	**148**	**61**	**41%**
Howard	17	4	24%
Randolph	131	57	44%
15	**390**	**244**	**63%**
Lafayette	236	161	68%
Saline	154	83	54%
16	**1,630**	**677**	**42%**
Jackson	1,630	677	42%
17	**731**	**486**	**66%**
Cass	526	334	63%
Johnson	205	152	74%
18	**442**	**355**	**80%**
Cooper	210	199	95%
Pettis	232	156	67%
19	**268**	**211**	**79%**
Cole	268	211	79%
20	**407**	**184**	**45%**
Franklin	352	159	45%
Gasconade	30	13	43%
Osage	25	12	48%
21	**3,432**	**1,908**	**56%**
St. Louis Co.	3,432	1,908	56%
22	**927**	**782**	**84%**
St. Louis City	927	782	84%
23	**967**	**531**	**55%**
Jefferson	967	531	55%
24	**412**	**288**	**70%**
Madison	42	27	64%
St. Francois	246	175	71%
St. Genevieve	44	37	84%
Washington	80	49	61%

Appendix O: Standard 2.3 Preliminary Inquiry of Delinquency Referrals within a Thirty Day Time Period

Circuit/County	Total Referrals Filed	Standard Met	Percent Standard Met
25	**322**	**241**	**75%**
Maries	49	0	0%
Phelps	217	36	17%
Pulaski	56	175	313%
Texas	0	30	NA
26	**463**	**295**	**64%**
Camden	106	77	73%
Laclede	173	77	45%
Miller	96	71	74%
Moniteau	24	20	83%
Morgan	64	50	78%
27	**176**	**140**	**80%**
Bates	32	20	63%
Benton	30	26	87%
Henry	83	73	88%
St. Clair	31	21	68%
28	**370**	**297**	**80%**
Barton	38	25	66%
Cedar	68	59	87%
Dade	14	12	86%
Vernon	250	201	80%
29	**352**	**169**	**48%**
Jasper	352	169	48%
30	**405**	**405**	**100%**
Dallas	76	76	100%
Hickory	14	14	100%
Polk	208	208	100%
Webster	107	107	100%
31	**364**	**210**	**58%**
Greene	364	210	58%
32	**388**	**320**	**82%**
Bollinger	12	8	67%
Cape Girardeau	318	257	81%
Perry	58	55	95%
33	**303**	**276**	**91%**
Mississippi	59	53	90%
Scott	244	223	91%
34	**204**	**197**	**97%**
New Madrid	77	76	99%
Pemiscot	127	121	95%
35	**362**	**304**	**84%**
Dunklin	165	114	69%
Stoddard	197	190	96%

Appendix O: Standard 2.3 Preliminary Inquiry of Delinquency Referrals within a Thirty Day Time Period

Circuit/County	Total Referrals Filed	Standard Met	Percent Standard Met
36	**384**	**331**	**86%**
Carter	349	302	87%
Butler	17	12	71%
Ripley	18	17	94%
37	**159**	**116**	**73%**
Howell	118	84	71%
Oregon	35	31	89%
Shannon	6	1	17%
38	**498**	**395**	**79%**
Christian	498	395	79%
39	**309**	**206**	**67%**
Barry	85	52	61%
Lawrence	134	90	67%
Stone	90	64	71%
40	**514**	**418**	**81%**
McDonald	222	194	87%
Newton	292	224	77%
41	**48**	**47**	**98%**
Macon	16	16	100%
Shelby	32	31	97%
42	**76**	**72**	**95%**
Crawford	17	17	100%
Dent	29	29	100%
Iron	5	3	60%
Reynolds	5	4	80%
Wayne	20	19	95%
43	**176**	**140**	**80%**
Caldwell	23	17	74%
Clinton	52	37	71%
Daviess	21	18	86%
DeKalb	19	16	84%
Livingston	61	52	85%
44	**88**	**81**	**92%**
Douglas	17	15	88%
Ozark	11	11	100%
Wright	60	55	92%
45	**270**	**100**	**37%**
Lincoln	205	75	37%
Pike	65	25	38%
46	**251**	**158**	**63%**
Taney	251	158	63%
Statewide Total	**19,869**	**12,856**	**65%**

Appendix P: Standard 2.3 Preliminary Inquiry of Status Referrals within a Thirty Day Time Period

Circuit/County	Total Referrals Filed	Standard Met	Percent Standard Met
1	**139**	**139**	**100%**
Clark	79	79	100%
Schuyler	20	20	100%
Scotland	40	40	100%
2	**131**	**122**	**93%**
Adair	69	64	93%
Knox	24	23	96%
Lewis	38	35	92%
3	**123**	**119**	**97%**
Grundy	82	81	99%
Harrison	11	8	73%
Mercer	6	6	100%
Putnam	24	24	100%
4	**253**	**237**	**94%**
Atchison	31	27	87%
Gentry	12	10	83%
Holt	27	27	100%
Nodaway	179	170	95%
Worth	4	3	75%
5	**398**	**308**	**77%**
Andrew	41	32	78%
Buchanan	357	276	77%
6	**105**	**90**	**86%**
Platte	105	90	86%
7	**58**	**31**	**53%**
Clay	58	31	53%
8	**117**	**86**	**74%**
Carroll	11	9	82%
Ray	106	77	73%
9	**133**	**106**	**80%**
Chariton	43	40	93%
Linn	56	41	73%
Sullivan	34	25	74%
10	**165**	**159**	**96%**
Marion	146	141	97%
Monroe	2	2	100%
Ralls	17	16	94%
11	**242**	**166**	**69%**
St. Charles	242	166	69%

Appendix P: Standard 2.3 Preliminary Inquiry of Status Referrals within a Thirty Day Time Period

Circuit/County	Total Referrals Filed	Standard Met	Percent Standard Met
12	**256**	**180**	**70%**
Audrain	134	83	62%
Montgomery	67	58	87%
Warren	55	39	71%
13	**958**	**558**	**58%**
Boone	651	385	59%
Callaway	307	173	56%
14	**380**	**237**	**62%**
Howard	38	23	61%
Randolph	342	214	63%
15	**267**	**166**	**62%**
Lafayette	121	75	62%
Saline	146	91	62%
16	**46**	**36**	**78%**
Jackson	46	36	78%
17	**676**	**474**	**70%**
Cass	428	254	59%
Johnson	248	220	89%
18	**268**	**239**	**89%**
Cooper	143	143	100%
Pettis	125	96	77%
19	**155**	**127**	**82%**
Cole	155	127	82%
20	**97**	**38**	**39%**
Franklin	86	31	36%
Gasconade	7	3	43%
Osage	4	4	100%
21	**1,035**	**647**	**63%**
St. Louis Co.	1,035	647	63%
22	**221**	**173**	**78%**
St. Louis City	221	173	78%
23	**592**	**421**	**71%**
Jefferson	592	421	71%
24	**233**	**200**	**86%**
Madison	10	9	90%
St. Francois	110	92	84%
St. Genevieve	63	60	95%
Washington	50	39	78%

Appendix P: Standard 2.3 Preliminary Inquiry of Status Referrals within a Thirty Day Time Period

Circuit/County	Total Referrals Filed	Standard Met	Percent Standard Met
25	**745**	**619**	**83%**
Maries	17	13	76%
Phelps	216	155	72%
Pulaski	334	290	87%
Texas	178	161	90%
26	**337**	**243**	**72%**
Camden	67	60	90%
Laclede	139	72	52%
Miller	56	48	86%
Moniteau	36	26	72%
Morgan	39	37	95%
27	**255**	**198**	**78%**
Bates	68	51	75%
Benton	49	38	78%
Henry	79	63	80%
St. Clair	59	46	78%
28	**282**	**245**	**87%**
Barton	31	26	84%
Cedar	54	49	91%
Dade	23	18	78%
Vernon	174	152	87%
29	**140**	**49**	**35%**
Jasper	140	49	35%
30	**181**	**177**	**98%**
Dallas	46	42	91%
Hickory	18	18	100%
Polk	77	77	100%
Webster	40	40	100%
31	**15**	**13**	**87%**
Greene	15	13	87%
32	**873**	**810**	**93%**
Bollinger	135	135	100%
Cape Girardeau	601	539	90%
Perry	137	136	99%
33	**132**	**114**	**86%**
Mississippi	21	10	48%
Scott	111	104	94%
34	**241**	**240**	**100%**
New Madrid	115	115	100%
Pemiscot	126	125	99%
35	**381**	**365**	**96%**
Dunklin	206	191	93%
Stoddard	175	174	99%

Appendix P: Standard 2.3 Preliminary Inquiry of Status Referrals within a Thirty Day Time Period

Circuit/County	Total Referrals Filed	Standard Met	Percent Standard Met
36	**129**	**122**	**95%**
Carter	120	114	95%
Butler	3	3	100%
Ripley	6	5	83%
37	**215**	**197**	**92%**
Howell	171	154	90%
Oregon	29	29	100%
Shannon	15	14	93%
38	**324**	**277**	**85%**
Christian	324	277	85%
39	**285**	**233**	**82%**
Barry	70	57	81%
Lawrence	140	115	82%
Stone	75	61	81%
40	**228**	**186**	**82%**
McDonald	74	60	81%
Newton	154	126	82%
41	**99**	**90**	**91%**
Macon	67	62	93%
Shelby	32	28	88%
42	**167**	**161**	**96%**
Crawford	4	4	100%
Dent	72	72	100%
Iron	48	47	98%
Reynolds	13	10	77%
Wayne	30	28	93%
43	**97**	**83**	**86%**
Caldwell	10	8	80%
Clinton	22	18	82%
Daviess	15	10	67%
DeKalb	4	4	100%
Livingston	46	43	93%
44	**29**	**25**	**86%**
Douglas	7	5	71%
Ozark	6	6	100%
Wright	16	14	88%
45	**292**	**193**	**66%**
Lincoln	251	179	71%
Pike	41	14	34%
46	**111**	**86**	**77%**
Taney	111	86	77%
Statewide Total	**12,606**	**9,785**	**78%**

Appendix Q: Standard 4.3 Preliminary Inquiry of CA/N Referrals within a Thirty Day Time Period

Circuit/County	Total Referrals Filed	Standard Met	Percent Standard Met
1	**263**	**260**	**99%**
Clark	145	144	99%
Schuyler	45	44	98%
Scotland	73	72	99%
2	**283**	**270**	**95%**
Adair	160	154	96%
Knox	36	35	97%
Lewis	87	81	93%
3	**443**	**432**	**98%**
Grundy	235	233	99%
Harrison	97	91	94%
Mercer	19	19	100%
Putnam	92	89	97%
4	**491**	**455**	**93%**
Atchison	56	51	91%
Gentry	26	24	92%
Holt	60	60	100%
Nodaway	340	315	93%
Worth	9	5	56%
5	**798**	**536**	**67%**
Andrew	71	46	65%
Buchanan	727	490	67%
6	**372**	**307**	**83%**
Platte	372	307	83%
7	**947**	**522**	**55%**
Clay	947	522	55%
8	**217**	**157**	**72%**
Carroll	28	23	82%
Ray	189	134	71%
9	**202**	**155**	**77%**
Chariton	57	53	93%
Linn	97	68	70%
Sullivan	48	34	71%
10	**352**	**329**	**93%**
Marion	305	285	93%
Monroe	13	12	92%
Ralls	34	32	94%
11	**1,259**	**756**	**60%**
St. Charles	1,259	756	60%
12	**762**	**561**	**74%**
Audrain	313	196	63%
Montgomery	201	180	90%
Warren	248	185	75%
13	**2,092**	**1,335**	**64%**
Boone	1,454	933	64%
Callaway	638	402	63%

Appendix Q: Standard 4.3 Preliminary Inquiry of CA/N Referrals within a Thirty Day Time Period

Circuit/County	Total Referrals Filed	Standard Met	Percent Standard Met
14	**714**	**402**	**56%**
Howard	76	47	62%
Randolph	638	355	56%
15	**693**	**435**	**63%**
Lafayette	376	247	66%
Saline	317	188	59%
16	**2,572**	**1,459**	**57%**
Jackson	2,572	1,459	57%
17	**1,811**	**1,209**	**67%**
Cass	1,269	764	60%
Johnson	542	445	82%
18	**801**	**666**	**83%**
Cooper	407	395	97%
Pettis	394	271	69%
19	**508**	**411**	**81%**
Cole	508	411	81%
20	**627**	**345**	**55%**
Franklin	527	279	53%
Gasconade	54	33	61%
Osage	46	33	72%
21	**5,055**	**3,062**	**61%**
St. Louis Co.	5,055	3,062	61%
22	**1,563**	**1,240**	**79%**
St. Louis City	1,563	1,240	79%
23	**1,813**	**1,202**	**66%**
Jefferson	1,813	1,202	66%
24	**827**	**646**	**78%**
Madison	64	48	75%
St. Francois	467	356	76%
St. Genevieve	135	125	93%
Washington	161	117	73%
25	**1,936**	**1,652**	**85%**
Maries	30	22	73%
Phelps	464	361	78%
Pulaski	1,017	893	88%
Texas	425	376	88%
26	**1,287**	**931**	**72%**
Camden	256	219	86%
Laclede	543	293	54%
Miller	240	205	85%
Moniteau	72	56	78%
Morgan	176	158	90%

Appendix Q: Standard 4.3 Preliminary Inquiry of CA/N Referrals within a Thirty Day Time Period

Circuit/County	Total Referrals Filed	Standard Met	Percent Standard Met
27	**792**	**663**	**84%**
Bates	213	172	81%
Benton	157	139	89%
Henry	297	251	85%
St. Clair	125	101	81%
28	**822**	**704**	**86%**
Barton	105	81	77%
Cedar	162	148	91%
Dade	47	40	85%
Vernon	508	435	86%
29	**668**	**389**	**58%**
Jasper	668	389	58%
30	**897**	**880**	**98%**
Dallas	180	166	92%
Hickory	40	40	100%
Polk	340	340	100%
Webster	337	334	99%
31	**808**	**651**	**81%**
Greene	808	651	81%
32	**1,579**	**1,436**	**91%**
Bollinger	161	156	97%
Cape Girardeau	1,147	1,023	89%
Perry	271	257	95%
33	**526**	**473**	**90%**
Mississippi	131	107	82%
Scott	395	366	93%
34	**575**	**565**	**98%**
New Madrid	236	235	100%
Pemiscot	339	330	97%
35	**1,063**	**956**	**90%**
Dunklin	479	382	80%
Stoddard	584	574	98%
36	**700**	**629**	**90%**
Carter	621	561	90%
Butler	28	20	71%
Ripley	51	48	94%
37	**436**	**372**	**85%**
Howell	326	275	84%
Oregon	72	67	93%
Shannon	38	30	79%
38	**1,109**	**871**	**79%**
Christian	1,109	871	79%
39	**871**	**704**	**81%**
Barry	335	285	85%
Lawrence	329	255	78%
Stone	207	164	79%

Appendix Q: Standard 4.3 Preliminary Inquiry of CA/N Referrals within a Thirty Day Time Period

Circuit/County	Total Referrals Filed	Standard Met	Percent Standard Met
40	**1,038**	**896**	**86%**
McDonald	411	365	89%
Newton	627	531	85%
41	**193**	**182**	**94%**
Macon	115	109	95%
Shelby	78	73	94%
42	**390**	**371**	**95%**
Crawford	52	50	96%
Dent	134	134	100%
Iron	84	78	93%
Reynolds	39	34	87%
Wayne	81	75	93%
43	**416**	**362**	**87%**
Caldwell	46	37	80%
Clinton	87	67	77%
Daviess	49	40	82%
DeKalb	33	30	91%
Livingston	201	188	94%
44	**184**	**170**	**92%**
Douglas	39	35	90%
Ozark	21	21	100%
Wright	124	114	92%
45	**803**	**502**	**63%**
Lincoln	683	459	67%
Pike	120	43	36%
46	**523**	**403**	**77%**
Taney	523	403	77%
Statewide Total	**43,081**	**31,914**	74%

Appendix R: 2024 Relative Rate Indices by County - All Offenses

County	Referrals Black	Referrals Hispanic	Referrals Asian	Cases Diverted Black	Cases Diverted Hispanic	Cases Diverted Asian	Secure Detention Black	Secure Detention Hispanic	Secure Detention Asian	Cases Petitioned Black	Cases Petitioned Hispanic	Cases Petitioned Asian
Adair	3.64											
Andrew	29.47											
Audrain	2.83											
Barry		0.28										
Bates	2.68											
Boone	8.14	0.45	0.57	0.91			1.96			1.79		
Buchanan	3.34	0.26					2.78			1.43		
Butler	4.43											
Callaway	3.60						2.14					
Cape Girardeau	7.98	1.98										
Cass	3.23	0.64					3.74			1.51		
Christian	3.05	0.41										
Clay	3.54	0.63										
Cole	6.03											
Cooper	8.03									1.79		
Dunklin	2.58	0.53										
Franklin	3.30											
Greene	7.32			0.67			2.18			1.61		
Grundy		2.98										
Henry	2.77											
Howard	2.76											
Jackson	3.79	0.34		0.85			2.59	3.09		2.77	3.78	
Jasper	3.84	0.70		0.59			2.11			2.98		
Jefferson	3.34	0.12	0.37				1.69					
Johnson	2.83											
Laclede	2.25											
Lafayette	2.66											
Lawrence		0.48										
Lincoln	3.01											
Livingston	6.92											
Macon	4.05											
Marion	2.55											
McDonald		0.33	0.32									
Miller	3.57											
Mississippi	4.13											
Montgomery	3.63											
New Madrid	3.25											
Newton			0.49									
Pemiscot	2.78											
Pettis	3.71	0.36										
Phelps	2.23											
Platte	3.43									2.13		
Polk	3.01	2.61										
Pulaski	1.52	0.23	0.29							3.03		
Randolph	3.20	0.51		0.73			2.81			2.77		
Ray	3.65											
Saline	3.90		2.76									
Scott	5.91											
St. Charles	4.30	0.60										
St. Louis County	5.70			0.89			4.52			5.56		
St. Louis City*	6.3/ -733						1.41/ -45			1.3/ -42		
Taney		0.37										
Warren	3.04											

* The statistical parity numbers for the City of St. Louis are included for reference only, since Black youth represent the largest demographic group.

** If the RRI is blank, this means it was not statistically significant.

Key: RRI/ PARITY

Appendix R: 2024 Relative Rate Indices by County - All Offenses

County	Delinquent Findings Black	Delinquent Findings Hispanic	Delinquent Findings Asian	Supervision Black	Supervision Hispanic	Supervision Asian	Secure Confinement Black	Secure Confinement Hispanic	Secure Confinement Asian
Audrain									
Boone									
Buchanan									
Butler									
Callaway									
Camden									
Cape Girardeau									
Cass									
Christian									
Clay									
Cole									
Cooper									
Dunklin									
Franklin									
Greene									
Henry									
Howard									
Howell									
Jackson									
Jasper									
Jefferson									
Johnson									
Laclede									
Lafayette									
Lewis									
Lincoln									
Livingston									
Macon									
Marion									
Mississippi									
Montgomery									
New Madrid									
Pemiscot									
Pettis									
Phelps									
Pike									
Platte									
Pulaski									
Randolph									
Ray									
St. Charles									
St. Francois									
St. Louis County									
St. Louis City*									
Saline									
Scott									
Stoddard									
Taney									
Texas									
Warren									

* The statistical parity numbers for the City of St. Louis are included for reference only, since Black youth represent the largest demographic group.

** If the RRI is blank, this means it was not statistically significant.